The Orthodox Doctrine

CONCERNING

Iustification by Faith

Asserted and Vindicated:

WHEREIN

The Book of Mr. *William Eyre*, one of the Ministers of *New Sarum*, is examined:

AND ALSO

The Doctrine of Mr. *Baxter* concerning Justification is discussed.

WRITTEN

By *John Eedes*, Minister of the Gospel.

ROM. 3. 24,25. *Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.*
Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.

Non opus est lege, quando impius per solam fidem justificatur.

LONDON,
Printed for *Henry Cripps* and *Lodowick Lloyd*, and are to be sold at their shop in Popes-Head Alley. 1654.

The Orthodox Doctrine
CONCERNING
Justification by Faith

The Contents of the ensuing Treatise.

CHAP. 1. *The Question is stated.*
CHAP. 2. *Justification is not an immanent or an eternall act of God.*
CHAP. 3. *Faith in the point is not to be taken objectively, but subjectively.*
CHAP. 4. *We are not justified ever since Christ rose.*
CHAP. 5. *The arguments of Mr. Woodbridge are vindicated.*
CHAP. 6. *And Mr. Eyres objections are examined whereby he seekes to*
CHAP. 7. *Prove that we are justified before faith.*
CHAP. 8. *Mr. Baxters doctrine concerning our Evangelicall righteousness, and justification by works is examined.*

TO THE

Right VVorshipful, his much honoured Friend, *Edward Dodington*, Esquire.

SIR,

THough so small a piece as this scarce dares presume to crave your Patronage, yet such is your noble disposition, that you will accept of the good will of him, who is ready to serve you on a greater occasion: Because I have written another Treatise concerning justification, I have in this been as brief as I might. If I find this to prove as profitable to the Church as I wish, it will incourage me to publish many other things, both practical and polemical, which I have in readinesse for the Presse. In the mean time I shall study to serve the Church in what I may, and with my prayers for your soules eternall happinesse, I rest

Your Worships to serve you in the Lord,

John Eedes.

To my Christian Brethren of the English Nation.

Deare Country-men,

GOD of rich mercy hath sent among us his saving truth, and we foolishly waxe wanton against him, in a manner all the truths of the Christian Religion are undermined, and while some go about to correct a former error, they fall into another. The doctrine concerning Justification hath been soundly taught by the Protestants; the Papists, Arminians, and now those that cry up free Grace, have opposed that truth, and while Mr. Baxter doth oppose these Antinomians, as they are called, he falls himselfe into another error that may prove of dangerous consequence. Mr Woodbridge in the heat of disputation denies that faith doth evidence our justification, yet I conceive, if you take him out of that heat, he will be of another mind: let no man blame me for forestalling Mr. Woodbridge, in the defence of Gods truth, every one is concerned, and we are to seeke his glory, and not our owne: I have abstained from quotations, because the book should not swell too much. I have omitted nothing of force or moment, I love those best that in few words speak to the purpose; it was in me endeavour to do so in this. I begin with the state of the question, that is most fit, and I direct an intelligent Reader so far that he may see how I follow Mr. Eyre in his book. I am sorry that he is mistaken in the point: though I had dealt against others in the point before, yet I the more willingly examined his Book, because there is more method, and acuteness in him then in the rest. I have abstain'd from hot words, a calme defence of the truth hath the most glorious victorie. I beseech you by the tender mercies of God to embrace the truth and so follow it as to attaine salvation, and so I rest,

Yours to serve you in the

Ministery of the Gospel,

John Eedes.

THE Orthodox Doctrine CONCERNING IVSTIFICATION Asserted and Vindicated.

CHAP. I. *The Question stated.*

§. 1. I Shall omit things impertinent, nor take notice of personall clashings, which do rather minister strife, then edification: And because I have at large handled this doctrine in another Tract, I shall confine my self to Mr. *Eyres* Book, intending to approve what is right, and to reject that which is not agreeable to the Word: Yet I shall omit quotations as much as may be, sith the Doctors are not authentick proof, and the Protestant Doctrine is well known. I shall not give any just cause of offence, and if any be offended without just cause, I shall not value it. I ought and dare to assert the truth, and in defence of it I doubt not of Gods assistance.

§. 2. I come now to state the Question, and first I will inquire concerning free grace.

Free grace is to beare much sway in this dispute, I will begin with that. In the Scripture it is mentioned as concerning Election, Justification, and Sanctification. In Election, Rom. 11.5. *A remnant according to the Election of grace,*

and the Election obtain'd, and the rest were blinded, Vers. 7. *Ephes.* 1.6. *To the praise of the glorie of his grace:* and, Rom 9. *When they had done neither good, nor evill, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand.* Against the Jesuites, and Arminians we have asserted, that Gods grace in election is most free, and that God did not elect one before another for merits or faith foreseene.

2. Grace is free as used in justification, *Rom.* 3.24 *justified freely by his grace*, yet vers. 25. *through faith in his blood:* the freenes of Gods grace in justification consists in this, that of rich mercy he pardons our sins in Christ, and accepts of the satisfaction of a mediator for us, and of us for the righteousnes of Christ; yet Gods free grace doth not exclude Christs righteousnes, nor our faith, but stablisheth both, *Rom.* 3. Vers. 24. 25. *Eph.* 2. 8. the Socinians wickedly seek to exclude Christs merits, and satisfaction; others seeke to exclude our faith.

3. Grace is free as it is used in sanctification, *Eph* 2.1.2. *Rom* 9.14.15.16. *Hee hath mercy on whom he will*, *i.e.* freely giving preventing grace, so the Orthodox Doctors defend against the Pelagians, that grace is not given according to merits. We have disliked in the Arminians, that they have taught that the good use of nature, and common aid deserves grace, and we reject the saying of the Schoolemen, *Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam:* hence we deduct this Corollary, that the doctrine of free grace rightly taught doth not exclude, but requires faith in justification.

S. 3. of justication by faith.

Against the Papists we have asserted, that justification is not a phisicall act, but a juridicall act; (*i. e.*) justification is not by inherent righteousnes, but God as Judge in the Court of mercy remits sin to the believer through Christs merits, and absolves the sinner repenting, and believing: yet we have constantly taught, that though justification and santification are distinct, yet that no man is justified that is not sanctified. We say that we are not justified by our inherent righteousnes, nor by our works, and we reject their distinction into the first and second justification.

We prove that the word justification is to be taken *juridicè, sensu forensi*, for the act of God as Judge in some Court, and that cannot be in the Court of the Law, for that condemnes, it must be then in the Court of the Gospell, that pardons sin, and delivers from condemnation, to which condemnation justification is opposed. Our Doctrine then is, *That God in time in the Court of mercy doth justifie the believer in and through the merits of Christ.*

Mr. *Eyre* takes faith in this point objectively, for the object of faith, (*i. e.*) Christ, and the sense then is, we are justified by faith, (*i. e.*) by Christ, and this he affirmes to be the opinion of our ancient Protestant Divines, *Pro.* 58.

But this is not so: the Scripture, though it affirme that we are justified by the righteousnes of Christ, or by his blood, death, &c. yet when it mentions justification by faith, it meanes that we believe, that faith that is in us, so *Joh.* 3.16. *Rom* 3.25. *Gal.* 2.16. *&c.* and our Protestant Divines in the point of justification take faith subjectively, see. *Confess. Anglic.* Article 11. so the Belgicke, Augustane, Saxon, Wittenberg, *&c.* so Dr. *Prid. Lect. de Justific.*

Calvine

Calvine Institut. &c. and this is the constant doctrine of the Protestants; yet we say, that we are justified by faith, that we with the Apostle affirme that *we are justified through faith in his blood through the redemption that is in Christ*; and so we reject the Arminian fancie that faith, the τὸ *Credere*, the believing is imputed to us for the fullfiling of the law: we also differ from the Papists, in that we say, that the speciall object of our faith is Christ crucified; in that we say, that a saving faith is a fiduciall assent, and that we say, faith doth receive and unite to Christ, and so we are justified by Christ, and reject their conceits, concerning faith, being a bare assent, and that they say it doth justify dispositively, helping to introduce the habit of charitie, and we do not attribute merit to faith as it justifies.

Our Divines have affirm'd that faith doth justify instrumentally, and relatively: this Mr. *Eyre*, Dr. *Hammond*, and Mr. *Baxter* dislike: but the doctrine is sound, and the terme is Orthodoxe, instrumentally, how? as a spirituall bond uniting to Christ, so *Joh.* 1. 12. we are so in Christ, and then hee is ours; we have union with him by faith, and then communion, and interest in his merits, so *Rom.* 8. 1. *Phil:* 3. 9. yet they say that it justifies us with respect to Christ, resting on his death, and so relatively, if you will, (*i. e.*) it engraffs into Christ, and embraceth, and applieth him, it seeketh justification in Christ alone, and Mr. *Baxters* reason against this doctrine is not of any force; for God by faith doth ingraffe us into Christ, and we by faith put on Christ, and so we are justified: And so it is Gods instrument, and it is the spirituall bond of our union with Christ; and yet we denie it not to be a condition required in the Court of the Gospell: but it is both a condition required, and the spirituall bond receiving Christ. Repentance is also a condition required in the Court of the Gospell, yet that is not the spiritual bond; and faith and repentance are not our Evangelicall righteousnes: so then faith in the matter of justification is to be taken subjectively, and it is a fiduciall assent, and it doth justifie us, being the spiritual bond that doth ingraffe us into Christ. Yet it is not our Evangelicall righteousnes.

2. Mr. *Eyre* goes on, and affirms, that justification is an immanent act of God, (*i. e.*) it is his decree not to punish such men. Here we grant that God before the world was made, did intend to justifie such men, but we denie that this decree of God is justification. God did intend to save his Elect in and through Christ, nor did God intend to save them but in and through Christ, and Christ is the cause of all the good things that concerne their salvation. And so wee say that God did intend not to punish them eternally in hell, but to redeeme them by Christ, to call them, to justifie, and to glorifie them, but the decree of justification is not justification it selfe, no more then the decree of glorification is glorification it selfe. Justification is the juridicall act of God in the Court of mercy, imparting remission of sins to believers.

3. Mr. *Eyre* adds, that justification is taken, *pro re volita*, for the thing wiled, so we have discharge from the law by Christs death, and we grant through Christ we obtaine remission of sins and deliverance from the curse of the law, and from hell, yet we have not this bestowed on us till we we believe. Christ pai'd the price of our redemption, and that redemption is in Christ. *Rom.* 3. 24. and

24. but he is a propritation ſet forth to us through faith in his blood. Chriſt did then obtaine redemption for us by paying the price, yet we are under the curſe of the law, and condemned in the Goſpell, till we believe, when we believe, the curſe of the law is taken off, and we are juſtified in the Court of the Goſpell.

Mr. *Eyre* ſaith, that juſtification is taken for the declared ſentence of abſolution, and forgiveneſs, and ſo God is ſaid to juſtifie when he declares it, and that is done more generally to all the elect, more particularly to individualls in the word, and in Gods works. 1. In his word, the Goſpell being an abſolute promiſe, ſo God declares it to the elect

2. In his works, in laying our ſins on Chriſt, and in diſcharging Chriſt at the reſurrection, and alſo in declaring it *in foro Eccleſiæ*, in the Church, by the uſe of his Ordinances, and inwardly in the conſcience, and at laſt before the whole world: thus Mr. *Eyre*.

We confeſſe that juſtification is the act of God, in the Court of mercy, it is the ſentence of the Goſpell doth abſolve us; and the Sacraments ſet this forth, and ſeale it up, but this is juſtification it ſelfe, the juſtification mentioned in the Scripture, and juſtification before God, the Goſpell doth not declare this to any in abſolute promiſes. The ſentence of the Goſpell is, *He that believeth ſhall be ſaved.* Chriſts death and paſſion is preſuppoſed, for Chriſts merits the Court of the Goſpell is ſet up, and through his redemption the believer is pardoned. Chriſt then paid the price of our redemption and at his reſurrection had a full diſcharge ſo far as concern'd the office of Mediator, yet the Court ſet up muſt paſſe on according to the ſentence. *He that believeth not ſhall be damned. He that believeth ſhall not be condemned.*

In the cloſe compare all together, you take faith objectively, and yet you ſay that it doth juſtifie declaratively in our conſcience, by evidencing it to us when we believe: theſe things do not accord, for you take it objectively, and ſubjectively too; you ſay, and unſay, and contradict your ſelfe: thus are men of parts, and learning intangled when they leave the truth.

S. 4. But to make all more plaine, I will yet with convenient brevitie add a few words more, and then proceed to the diſpute.

1. The word *Juſtifie* is to be taken *juridicè*, for a juridicall act of God, the word faith is to be taken ſubjectively, for our believing in Chriſt; the faith in us is to be, not only a dogmaticall faith, or a bare aſſent of the underſtanding, but a fiducicall aſſent, or an affiance placed on Chriſt; yet all juſtifying faith is not a full perſwaſion that our ſins are forgiven, ſtrong faith hath this certainty of evidence, yet that faith that adheres to Chriſt is a ſaving faith; and we ſay that we are juſtified by faith, not as the meritorious cauſe, but becauſe faith doth unite to Chriſt, by whoſe righteouſneſſe we are juſtified, and becauſe faith is a condition required in the Court of the Goſpel; yet the *τὸ credere*, the believing is not imputed for the fulfilling of the Law, nor is it our Evangelicall righteouſneſſe: but we are juſtified by faith, becauſe faith receiveth and uniteth to Chriſt, and becauſe they that are in Chriſt are freed from condemnation: And though theſe words, *we are juſtified by faith*, cannot be underſtood ſo as if it did import our juſtification in the court of our conſcience,

yet

yet it is true that faith doth evidence this to the consciences of the godly; so that I cannot joyne with those that say that faith doth not evidence this to the conscience, yet I must with them affirme, that whereas the Scripture doth mention our justification by faith, it cannot be so understood. We are justified before God by faith in Christ, and yet faith growing strong doth evidence this to the conscience, but that is not called justification, but peace, joy, inward sealing, tasting *how good the Lord is.*

I come now to lay downe, and to assert these positions.

1. *Justification by faith is not an immanent, and eternall act of God.*
2. *Faith in the point of justification is not to be taken objectively but subjectively.*
3. *We are not justified ever since Christs resurrection.*
4. *We are not justified before faith, or without faith.*
5. *Faith and repentance though they are conditions required in the Court of the Gospell, yet they are not our Evangelicall righteousnesse, nor are we justified by our works that are from obedience of faith.*

Chap. II.

Justification by faith is not an immanent, and eternall act of God.

S. 1. I Most willingly grant that there was from everlasting in God, a will not to punish his Elect, but yet we must say that God did intend to save them through Christ, and to justifie them by faith in the blood of Christ: for God doth work all things according to the councill of his will, by what meanes God doth save in time, by the same meanes he in his decree did intend to save them but this eternall decree of God is not the justification mentioned in the Scriptures, and affirmed to be by faith; you may call that the decree of justification it is not justification it selef: Justification is the act of God in time, the juridicall act of God in the Court of mercy and so it is not an immanent or eternall act, And this I prove.

1. Justification is the act of God as Judge, a juridicall act, because it is oppos'd to condemnation: but God exerciseth his acts as Judge in time: *Ergo* it is not an eternall act.

2. Justification is a fruit of predestination. Rom. 8. 30. no effect of predestination is bestowd on the elect *ab æterno*. *Ergo* justification is not an eternall act.

3. Christ in time did merit for us remission of sins, therefore we had not that *ab æterno*, because Christs death in time did merit that for us.

Except. Gods will not so punish us was to do it for Christs sake.

Reply. Yet that decree not to punish, is not justification, for God pardons in and by Christ, and God declares this in his Court of mercy.

4. So justification, and election are confounded.

Except. They are distinct by their objects, election comprehends all the meanes of salvation, justification is a will not to punish.

Reply. That is not enough, for justification is a fruit of election following in time, and so not to be confonded with the decree.

5. Justification imports a change from unjust to just, which cannot be attributed to the simple, and unchangeable decrees of God,

Except. Take justification *pro re volita*, for the thing willed (*i. e.*) the delivery of a sinner from the curse of the law, then there is a change; if you take it for the will of God not to punish, there is no change, God hath not altered his will, the change then ariseth from the law, and mans consideration in reference thereto, but being considered at the tribunall of grace, he is righteous, which is not a different state before God, but a different consideration of the same person.

Reply. 1. Take it as you ought, and then because mans state in time is changed by justification, mans justification is not an eternall act, because in time man is justified at the tribunall of grace, this absolution of man in the Court of the Gospell is a transient act of God, and so not eternall.

2. Though in justification righteousness be imputed, there is a reall change (*i. e.*) a morall, the person before in state of damnation is now justified.

3. Though election for a long time make no change inherent, yet justification makes a reall, yet morall change, and so it is a transient act.

6. Gods decree to create, to call, to glorifie, are not creation, calling, glorification. *Ergo*, his will to justifie is not justification.

Except. Creation, vocation, and glorification import an inherent change in the person, not so justification, that is complete in the mind of God.

Reply. Though justification being by imputation cause not an inherent change in the person justified, yet it causeth a morall change; the person that was in the state of damnation, is now absolved, and that is to be done in some Court, and by God as Judge, and so in time.

7. That which followeth vocation, is in time, but justification followeth vocation, *Rom.* 8. 30. vocation follows predestination, glorification follows justification: *Ergo* justification follows vocation.

8. No man can be justified unless he be in Christ, but no man is in Christ *ab æterno*: *Ergo* no man is justified *ab æterno*: The *major* is plaine, *Rom.* 8. 1. *Colos.* 1. 14. *Ephes.* 1. 7. *Phil.* 3. 9. the *minor* is plaine, 1. We were not *ab æterno*, 2. Faith unites to Christ. 3. Some are in Christ before others.

9. No man is justified before his sins be remitted: but we obtaine remission of sins in time, *Colos*: 1. 14. *Iohn* preached the baptisme of repentance for remission of sins. *Ananias* to *Paul*, *arise and be baptized washing away thy sins*. *Ergo* justification is not an eternall act of God.

10. Justification, and sanctification are inseperable companions, but we are sanctified in time, 1. *Cor*: 6. 10. 11. *Eph*: 2. 1. 2. 3. *Ergo* we are justified in time, and not *ab æterno*.

S. 3. I proceed to their objections.

Ob. Justification is the act of Gods mind, or will, a will not to punish is justification, so the word חשב and λογίτομαι, and we are commanded to forgive from the heart, and so to imitate God.

Sol. 1. We grant that there is in God a will not to punish, nor doth this will arise in God *de novo*. God did decree to spare, and to pardon, and to accept of such, and to justifie them through faith in Christ: yet we say that this decree

of

of God is not justification, but a decree to justifie, justification is Gods juridicall act, in the court of mercy, and God doth this as Judge, and for the merits of his Son, *in whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of our sins, Coloss.* 1. 14. and remission of sins is this justification.

2. Though חשב signifies to think, and import an act of the mind, Gods not imputing sin, and imputing righteousnes is not a meere act of his mind, but the act of God in his court according to his purpose, it is Gods act as Judge according to the sentence of the Gospell which is Gods court, and this will appeare, 1. Because God is said to blot out, to hide, cover, not to lay them to ones charge. 2. Because here is Christ our advocate, who died in time, by whose blood we are justified. 3. Because there is our faith, by which we receive Christ to our justification.

3. We are to forgive from the heart, so doth God too, for the sentence of the Gospel is Gods sentence, according to his owne will, or mind, and so stands firme, and that for ever.

Ob. God by this immanent act doth secure men from wrath, and by it the elect stand discharged, and Gods love to them is everlasting, and *who can lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? Rom.* 8.

Sol. 1. God by his eternall decree did resolve to save the elect, but God doth justifie them in his court of mercy, this is his juridicall act, and so they are to bee secured; this they have to plead, and thus they may stand against all the assaults of Satan, because God in the Gospell doth acquit them.

2. Gods eternall love to the elect doth not infer an eternall justification; justification is an effect of that eternall love, and God in time, or after time, confers on the elect all the fruits of his everlasting love.

3. Though God doth justifie the elect in their severall generations, yet they are not justified *quatenus* elect, but in as much as they are believers, and accepted in his beloved, in whom they have remission of sins.

Ob. Justification is an immanent act of God, because it doth not worke any inherent change in man, but remaines complete in the mind of God.

Sol. Though it cause no inherent, or phisicall change, yet it causeth a morall change, so as a juridicall act may: it alters the state of the person, and that before God, he that was in state of damnation, and under the curse of the law, is now justified, and absolved: and justification is not meerely Gods decree, but the absolution of the believer in the court of mercy according to Gods decree.

Ob. We were elected in him before the foundation of the world, *Ephes.* 1. 4. *Ergo* we were justified *ab æterno.*

Sol. We were elected in him, not that we were actually existing in him, but that we might be ingrafted into Christ, and justified, and saved by him.

Ob. 2. *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Jesus Christ before the world began.*

Sol. 1. We confesse that Gods decree of election is eternall, and that it is of rich grace.

2. Yet the fruits of election are conferred in time, as the sending of Christ, our vocation, and sanctification, and also our justification.

Chap. III.

Faith in the point of justification is not to be taken objectively but subjectively it doth not denote to us Christ in whom we believe, but our faith, by which we believe in Christ.

1. THis is so plaine, that it needs no explication, yet that none may unjustly blame us, we constantly affirme, that we are justified through the redemption that is in Christ, and we have remission of sins in his blood, and he is the Lord our righteousnes, but we are called to believe in Christ, *Joh.*3.16. and none else shall be saved, *Marke* 16.16. *and we are justified by faith in his* blood, and this I prove.

Arg. 1. The word calls us to believe, *Ioh:*14.1.2. *Ioh:*3.16. *Mat:*11.28. *&c.* but our believing is not the object of our faith.

2. The Sacraments serve to excite, and to confirme our faith, and to shew our spirituall union with Christ by faith; so that we by faith dwell in him, and hee in us.

3. In the point of Justification, Christ the object of our Faith is plainly named, and our Believing is mentioned as our act, as something in us, and not without us: Christs righteousnes is received by our faith, and it is by faith in his blood, and we have believed in Christ to be justified, *Gal.*2.16.

4. The sentence of the Gospel, which is Gods sentence, pronounceth, that the believer is saved, justified, absolved; that the unbeliever is under wrath, and *he that believeth not shal be damned.*

5. The Apostle shews, that *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteousnes*, Rom 4. and we are justified so as he was.

6 You say, that faith doth evidence this in the court of the conscience after we believe, you grant then that faith in the point of Justification must bee taken subjectively, for our believing, and not objectively for Christ in whom we believe.

*S.*3. Yet Mr. *Eyres* objects.

Ob. Faith is our work, and to say that we are justified by faith subjectively, is to say that we are justified by our worke, which is contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle, who denies justification by works.

Sol. 1. We willingly acknowledg what *Zanchy* saith on *Rom:* Faith doth not justifie as a vertue, or worke of us, not by it's owne merit, dignitie, or worth, no; faith comes to Christ for all merit, yet we that are justified by Christs merits receive Christ by faith, and being in him are justified.

2. To be justified by faith in Christ, and to be justified by works are by the Apostle opposed, so that to be justified by faith in Christ, is not to be justified by works, *Rom.*3.28. *Eph.*2.8. *Gal.*2.16.

3. You cannot in the same sentence take faith objectively, and subjectively too; you cannot therefore in the point of justification take it objectively, but subjectively, Christ the object of a saving faith is set forth to us in other fit, and convenient words, faith in Christs blood doth justifie.

CHAP. VIII.

We are not justified ever since Christs resurrection

CHrist at his death paid the price of our redemption, and when Christ rose God did give our mediator a full discharge, yet we are not actually, and compleately justified before we believe, and are ingraffed into Christ.

S. 1. Sith Mr. *Eyre* doth burden Mr. *Woodbridg* with Arminianisme, it will be fit to cleer the doctrine we maintaine; 1. The Arminians say, that Christ died for all indiscriminatim, without distinction of elect, or reprobate: we say, that Christ died especially for the elect; so *Ambrose*, *Christus mortuus est pro omnibus communiter, specialiter pro electis.* Christ died for all after a sort, specially for the elect; in a word, Christs death is sufficient to save all, and he is to be propos'd to all as a sufficient meanes of salvation, or else we could not call men to believe on him, yet he died especially for the elect, so as infalibly to bring them to salvation: yea he did not only merit remission of sins for them, if they would believe, but he also did merit grace for them, that they should indeed in their due time believe, and persevere, and be saved. 2. We acknowledg, that they distinguish betweene the impetration of reconciliation, and the application of it, and *Amel: Antisinod: P: 169.* confesseth, that their is a distinction between the impetration, and application of reconciliation, yet in this they and we differ, for they conceive that though Christ by his death obtain'd reconciliation, yet so it might come to passe, that no man might have had benefit thereby. We affirme that Christ so obtaind reconciliation for the elect, that they shall infalibly obtaine it, and be saved. Againe, they will not owne that Christ merited grace, which should infalibly save the elect, we confesse it, and assert it: yet in this we differ from Mr. *Eyre*, we say, that Christ then reconciled us virtually; but that we are not reconciled completely till we believe: and if any *Diviner* have said, that we were justified ever since Christ rose, those words must be taken not strictly and properly but in a large sense: so in Christ we have taken possession of heaven, and yet we are not actually there till we are translated out of this life: that Christ as a common person died, and rose, we grant; and that he died for the elect especially we confesse, and that he died, and rose as the head for the members, we denie not, yet we denie that the elect were justified properly and strictly, and in complete act since Christs death, and resurrection, the price of our redemption was paid at Christs death, our mediator had a full discharge for our good at his resurrection; this in due time was to save, and to justifie the elect, yet in the meane time it inheres in Christ as in it's subject, *Rom.* 3. 24. the redemption that is in Christ, and his blood is of force to save us in the Court of mercy, and then it doth justifie and save when we by faith are in Christ, and performe the conditions required in the Gospel. Before Christs death the elect were saved in their severall generations, because Christ was *a lambe slaine from the foundation of the world*, and the Court of mercy was ser up as founded on Christs blood, that was in force to save, because he in Gods due time was to suffer. So after Christs death it is in force to save us in our generations, but to save us according

according to the tenour of the Goſpel (*i.e.*) when we believe, and repent. I come therefore to this concluſion, That Chriſt paid the price of our redemption at his death, and had a diſcharge from our ſins, as our Mediatour at his reſurrection, yet that all the elect were not then in complete act juſtified, they had reconciliation then *actu virtuali*, in a virtuall act, but they have it not in complete act till they believe: and this I prove.

S. 2. *Arg.* 1. My firſt Argument is taken from 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20, 21. there is mentioned a twofold reconciliation, one by Chriſts paſſion, who was made ſin for us, and another we are beſeeched to receive: if after the reconciliation made by Chriſt in offering up himſelf we are yet to be reconciled, and in the Goſpel intreated to be reconciled, we are not juſtified ever ſince Chriſts paſſion and reſurrection, but we are called on to be reconciled, and the Apoſtle adds, that Chriſt died, *that we might be made the righteouſneſſe of God in him.*

2. *Rom* 5. 8, 9, 10. Reconciliation and juſtification are diſtinguiſhed, and we are ſaid to be reconciled by Chriſts bloud while we were ſinners and enemies; but to be juſtified now by Chriſt: So thence it followes, that we were reconciled while we were ſinners and enemies, but not juſtified while ſinners and enemies: For, to be ſinners and enemies, and to be juſtified, are oppoſed, 1 *Cor.* 6. 10, 11. *Such were ſome of you, but you are juſtified, but you are ſanctified.*

3. Though Chriſt hath merited remiſſion of ſins, yet we are called on to repentance, and to believe, that we may obtain remiſſion of ſins, but if we muſt repent, and believe, to obtain remiſſion of ſins, we are not juſtified before we believe and repent. We are called on to repent, and to believe, *Mark* 1. 15. ſo Chriſt preached the Goſpel, *Iohn* 3. 16. *Mark* 16. 16. and are juſtified through *faith in his bloud*, *Rom.* 3. 25. and we are called on to repent, *Acts* 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized for the remiſſion of ſins:* ſo *Luke* 24. 45. repentance and remiſſion of ſins are to be preached in Chriſts name; but if we muſt believe and repent to obtain remiſſion of ſins, we are not juſtified before we believe, then Chriſt would not have called us to repentance and faith, nor taught his Apoſtles to preach repentance, and remiſſion of ſins.

4. Thoſe which believe not are under wrath, *Iob.* 3. 36. condemned in the law for ſin, and in the Goſpel for unbeliefe, *Marke* 16. 15. 16. *He that believeth not ſhall be damned*; therefore we are not juſtified ever ſince Chriſts reſurrection.

Except. God hath juſtified them in Chriſt as a common perſon. 2. Finall unbeliefe doth damne, not preſent unbeliefe.

Reply. 1. Though God accepted of Chriſts juſtification as fully meritorious, yet he did not juſtifie the elect that are unbelievers. 1. For God as judge judgeth according to truth. 2. God judgeth according to the tenour of his courts.

5. An unbeliever is condemned in the court of the law for ſin, in the court of the Goſpel for unbeliefe.

6. Preſent unbeliefe leaves one in the ſtate of damnation for the preſent, and finall unbeliefe ſeales up damnation for ever.

7. We are taught to pray to God for forgiveneſſe of ſins, *Mat.* 6. and the godly

godly have praid for pardon, and we must confesse our sins, and sue to God for mercy, but if we were justified ever since Christs death, and resurrection, we in these dais need not pray for pardon, nor to seek forgiveness of sins.

S. 3. I proceed to the objections.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre* p. 146, argues thus. They that were in Christ as a common person before they believed, were justified before they believed; but many were in Christ as a common person before they believed: *Ergo* many were justified before they believed.

This you prove, because Christ was justified at his resurrection, and so before many do believe in him, and sith Christ was a common person and justified, they that were represented by him, were justified.

I answer thus.

Sol. 1. Christ was justified as our Mediatour, God at Christs resurrection did discharge him, and acknowledg that he had made full paiment, and Christ in his passion and resurrection was a common person. (*i.e.*) stood as our mediatour, as the second *Adam*, and as the head of the Church, who bought it by his blood: and sith Christ was a common person, the benefit of it doth redound to the elect of God, yet not so as actually and completely to justifie them, but to be in force to justifie them according to the tenour of the Gospel.

2. Sith Christ died especially for the elect, we were in a sort in him when he died, and rose; he did so sustain the person of all the elect, as to pay a full price for their redemption; but yet they were not in Christ till they did believe, not really in Christ, nor members of his mistical body actually, and so they were not justified till they were in him by faith, and so none were justified at Christs death, and resurrection, but they that then believed on him: before Christs passion believers received remission of sins, and since his passion none have remission of sins till they believe.

M. Woodb. Christ was not justified according to the tenor of the new covenant.

3. *I. Distinct. exem. i.e.* Not according to the tenour of the Gospel, which offers us remission of sins, so that we believe; yet as I said, Christ as our Mediator had a discharge, but of that covenant in what followeth. Mr. *Woodb.* adds a distinction of justification purposed, purchased, and exemplified, which may have its use, yet Gods purpose is not in Scripture called justification; nor is our redemption by Christs death called justification, but ransome, propitiation. Christ rising, you say, was justified, and that Mr. *Woodb.* calls justification exemplified, *i.e.* as Christ rising was fully discharged, so we believing shall be absolved: and so all your objections hurt him not. We presume not do to the office of a Mediator, nor do we think that Christ had any sin, nor are we our own Saviours by believing; nor doth this savour of Pelagianism, or Socinianism, sith we acknowledge the efficacy of grace, and the merit of Christs death. Yet Mr. *Eyre* I grant that Christ was a common person, and yet fear not your argument. Mr. *Woodbridge* adds another distinction which is more pertinent.

4. *II. Distinct.* We were casually and virtually justified in Christs justification, but not actually and formally, or as I noted out of *Amef.* we were then reconciled *actu virtuali*, but not *actu completo*: Christ paid the price of

our

our redemption at his death, God acknowledged this at Chriſts reſurrection, yet we are not actually, compleetely juſtified till we believe. This diſtinction Mr. *Eyre* invades.

Inſtan. 1. The *formale* of juſtification is the non-imputation of ſin, our ſins were imputed to Chriſt even to a full ſatisfaction, and ſo they could not be imputed to us. Yet Chriſts death doth juſtifie us only virtually, but the ſatisfaction in his death being performed, and accepted for us, doth juſtifie us formally; for the actuall payment of a debt is that which formally makes him that was the debter to be no debter; and therefore Chriſts dying for us, his reconciling us to God, and our being juſtified, are *Synonima's* in the Scripture phraſe: ſo Mr. *Eyre*.

Reply, and Solution. 1. We grant, that the *formale* of juſtification is the non-imputation of ſin yet we muſt add, it is the non-imputation of ſin in the Court of the Goſpel, and according to the tenour of that Court, and that juſtifies none but believers.

2. Chriſt made payment, ſo that God requires no other payment to be made, yet God requires us to be in Chriſt before hee wil actually diſcharge us, God doth judg according to the ſentence of the Goſpell, and that doth diſcharge, but thoſe that believe and repent.

3. If we are juſtified only virtually by Chriſts death, the Controverſie is ended. I confeſſe that when the ſatisfaction is performd, and accepted, we are compleatly juſtified: but though it was performed and accepted for full ſatisfaction, yet it is not accepted for ſuch a one, ſo as to juſtifie him actually and compleatly, till hee believe, when we believe, and are in Chriſt, then wee have actual intereſt in Chriſts righteouſneſs, and then we are diſcharged by Gods juridical ſentence.

4. Though we are ſaid to be juſtified by Chriſts death, and to be reconciled, and redeemed thereby, yet we are never ſaid to be juſtified ſo by his death, as to be juſtified before faith, or till we believe, & ſo the diſtinction ſtands, we were reconciled to God virtually by Chriſts death, but completely when we beleve.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre* propoſeth an objection. 2 *Cor*: 5. 21. Chriſt was *made ſin for us that we might be made the righteouſneſs of God in him:* whence we inferre, that though Chriſts merits do juſtifie us, yet we are not juſtified til we belive, becauſe there intervenes time between Chriſts death and our actual juſtification had wee then been juſtified, the Apoſtle would not have ſaid that wee might be juſtified, or *made the righteouſneſs of God in him.*

Except. Of Mr. *Eyre*. 1. That we might be, doth not ſignifie the finall, but the formall cauſe, 2. The imputation of ſin to Chriſt, and non-imputation of it to us, is one and the ſame act of God; as verſ: 19. and that was before the word of reconciliation was ſent, and ſo before faith. 3. Though the imputation of our ſin to Chriſt, and the non-imputation of it to us have an antecedency in reſpect of imputation of righteouſneſs to us, yet it is of nature only, and not of time.

Reply. 1. We grant that Chriſts merit is the meritorious, or materiall cauſe of our juſtification. The formall cauſe of juſtification is our abſolution, the final cauſe is Gods glory in the declaration of his rich mercy, and alſo our ſal-

vation

final cause is Gods glory, in the declaration of his rich mercy, and also our salvation; but this takes not off the force of the Argument, Christ was made an offering for our sins, that so we might be justified. not that we were presently actually justified, for then the Apostle would not beseech us to be reconciled, as Ver. 19. nor would Christ send them out to preach repentance and remission of sins, nor should we receive remission of sins, and that through faith in his blood.

2. God was in Christ by Unitie of Essence, and reconciled the world to himself, not imputing to them their trespasses, yet the Apostle mentions a double reconciliation, Ver.19. one obtained by Christ in paying the price of our Redemption, and another which we actually enjoy when we believe, *We beseech you be reconciled*; and *Rom.5. reconsiled when enemies*, but now justified when we believe: So *Joh.3.16. God so loved the world that he gave his Son* (i.e) *to obtain redemption for us*; but yet *that whosoever believes in him should not perish*; so then God not impures sin when Christ paid the price of our Redemption, God acknowledged that he had paid the full price of our redemption, and so a court of mercy was set up, yet so, that then we should be justified indeed when we have the sentence of that court to acquit and absolve us.

3. Christs meritorious death being the cause of our justification, it must be antecedent in order of nature, at least in divine acceptance, so in vers.7. and sith we are commanded to believe that we may be saved and justified, it doth now (in ver.7.) since his passion precede our justification in time, for many yeers intervene between his passion and our believing; as for personal clashings in hot words between them, I omit them and go on.

Chap. V.

We are not justified before faith, or without faith.

§.1. SIth Mr. *Eyre* takes justification, properly so called, to be the eternal and immanent act of God, he conceives it to be eternal, and so before faith; we confess, that God did intend to justifie and to save the elect, and to justifie them, being by faith ingrafted into Christ, but this justification is Gods juridical act in the court of mercy, and the sentence of that Court doth absolve none but believers; we do not conceive any alteration to be in Gods will, or that such a resolution doth arise in him *de novo*: Yet (though I dare not bee too curious in searching into Gods internal and eternal acts) let me propose this to our consideration, God knows the godly, *Psal.1. God hears the prayers of the righteous*, *Psal.34.* and God sees into all things that are done, and without any alteration in his knowledge or will; so God that did before time intend to justifie the Elect, doth in fit time justifie them according to his declaration in the word, God doth this as an act of mercy, yet as a Judge in some court, and so it being an act of grace, it is Gods juridical act in the court of the Gospel, the sentence of that court is Gods sentence, and God that knows the godly hears our prayers, looks into all things, doth approve the sentence of that court, absolving those that believe and repent.

True it is, that Christ hath merited for us remission of sins, and grace to enable us to believe, yet God who saves us in Christ as our head, and husband, requires that we should be in Christ, and on union with him followes justification, but our union is made up by faith, and so we call it the spiritual bond, and the instrument receiving Christ, and so it justifies, and sith the covenant of grace is founded on Christs blood, and the court of mercy erected for his meritorious passion, God doth in that court dispence the salvation, mercy, or pardon merited for us by Christ, and sith the Gospel doth require of us faith and repentance, condemnes for want of faith and repentance, and absolveth those that believe, and repent, we say that faith and repentance are conditions required in the court of the Gospel, or in the covenant of grace. Yet sith it is a court of mercy, wherein God pardons the sinner for the righteousnes of Christ, we looke on faith, and repentance as not meritorious of our justification, but we looke on faith, as that which unites to Christ, and on faith and repentance as conditions required in the Gospel, and so we are taught in the word: I have discuss'd this point in another tract against D. *Crisp*, Mr *Denne*, and Mr. *Saltmarsh*, I intend for brevitie to vindicate the argument proposed by M. *Woodbridge*, and to examine the objections of Mr. *Eyre*, yet something is already dispatched in the former Chapt.

S. 2. *Arg.* 1. M. *Woodbridge* 1. Allegeth testimonies of Scripture, *Rom.* 5. 1. *Gal.* 2. 16. *Rom.* 8. 30. *Act.* 4. 24. *Act.* 10. 43. and 13. 39. and 26. 18, *&c.* in which places it is said we are justified by faith, we have believed that we might be justified, and righteousnes shall be imputed to us if we believe, and justification is after vocation.

Mr. *Eyre* saith, that Mr. *Woodbridge*, in his preface affirm'd that it was the scope of the Apostle in this Epistle to prove that we are justified by faith, (*i.e.*) by our believing, and this is most true. Mr. *Eyre* objects, so we should be justified by our worke, and so the Apostle would contradict himselfe.

Exam. But when the Papists made this weake objection, it did not move, or unsettle our former *Divines*, they did easily answer, that faith doth not justifie by its merit, or dignitie, but as an instrument uniting us to Christ, and so Mr. *Woodbridge* is not mistaken in the scope of the Apostle.

Mr. *Eyre* goes on, *pag.* 40 to Mr. *Woodbridges* application, wherein he affirmes that Mr *Woodbridge* said to unbelievers that Christ was no Priest or advocate to them; it may be that was a speech unwary, yet unbelievers have no interest in Christ or in the promises, they are condemned in the law for sin, in the Gospel for unbeliefe, present unbeliefe leaves them in the state of damnation, finall unbeliefe doth seale it up: Now we come to examine what Mr. *Eyre* hath to say to the places of Scripture quoted.

Excep. 1. Justification by Faith, and justification before faith, are not *opposita*.

Reply. They are to be justified by faith, and to be justified without faith, are opposite; but to be justified before faith, is to be justified without faith.

2. *Except. Rom.* 5. 1. *Being justified by faith, we have peace with God*; or *being by Christ justified we have peace with God*: Faith doth not procure justification, but begets peace in our consciences.

Reply

Reply 1. So the sense is marred; for this being an inference out of the former Doctrine, ch. 3, & 4 lays down for granted what was formerly proved; but in ch. 3 & 4 the Apostle proved our justification by faith. ch 3. 24, 25. & ch. 4. *Abraham believed, and so was justified*, Ergo, Mr. *Eyre* must take it, and read it as we usually do.

2. Though faith in some places be taken objectively for the Doctrine of the Gospel, yet when it is said, that we are justified by faith, it is to be taken subjectively for our believing; so *John* 3. 16. *Rom.* 3. 25. *Gal.* 2. 16 *&c. Rom.* 8. 30. whom he hath predestinated he hath called; whom he hath called he hath justified, *&c.* Vocation follows Predestination, and glory follows justification; *Ergo*, Justification follows Vocation to faith.

Except. Mr. *Eyre.* 1. That is not always first set in Scripture which is first in nature. 2. The Apostles intent is not to shew in what order they are bestowed, but to shew how unseperably they are linked together, so that sin or affliction cannot make them miserable whom God hath chosen. 3. The *formale* of justification is to have it terminated in our consciences: so M. *Eyre*, *&c.*

Reply. 1. Though that is not always first in Nature that is first set, yet it is so in this place: 1. Because in this Golden Chain one link is joyned to another, and by Divines it is called the Series of Salvation. 2. It must be so here, because predestination precedes vocation, justification precedes glory; *Ergo*, vocation precedes justification. 3. Because in Scripture we are called to faith. and to repentance, that we may obtain remission of sins, *Acts* 38. *Mat.* 3. *Luke* 24 45. *&c.*

Secondly, Unless they stand in order they are dis-join'd, one link taken out of the chain dis-joyns the rest, not onely the inseperableness is shew'd, but the order how they are inseperable.

3. It is so manifest in the Scripture, that to be justified by faith is to be justified before God, that it cannot with shew of reason be taken for justification in our own consciences: but of this more in what followeth.

Thirdly, *Rom.* 4. 24. *Righteousness shall be imputed to us if wee believe*, *Ergo*, not before wee believe: *Ergo*, faith is a condition required to justification.

Except. Mr. *Eyre.* 1. The consequence is not necessary, for it doth not alwaies denote a condition by which a benefit is to be obtained, but seems to describe the person to whom it doth belong: as 2 *Tim.* 21. *Heb.* 3. 6. So it is then that hereby wee may know that righteousness is imputed to us if wee believe.

Reply. The consequence holds good; because righteousness is not imputed to unbelievers: hee that believeth not, the wrath of God abideth on him, *John* 3. 36. *He that believeth not shall be damned.* 2. Because wee are called to faith that wee may be justified. 3. The Apostle shews that so *Abraham* was justified. 4. So wee shall be justified if wee believe. 5. The Apostle, *Rom.* 4. hath no one title concerning signs of our justification, but concerning means of justification.

2. Though it may be granted that in the places mentioned by Mr. *Eyre*, the term *if* do not denote the cause of consequence; yet that doth not weaken the force of the present Argument.

Fourthly, *Acts* 10. 43. & 26. 18. & 13. 39 plainly prove that none but believers are juſtified, and that we receive remiſſion of ſins by faith.

Excep. Mr. *Eyre.* 1. They prove not that the Elect are not juſtified before believing. 2. God gives remiſſion of ſins before we believe, but we receive not remiſſion of ſins till we believe, we receive remiſſion of ſins by faith.

Reply. 1. Sith theſe places prove that believers believe, and receive remiſſion of ſins, and other places prove that unbelievers are under wrath, hence it follows, that the believers, and they onely, have pardon.

2. When God gives remiſſion of ſins, we receive it; therefore that diſtinction is vain, ſo all are joyn'd, *Rom.* 3. 24. 25. God juſtifies, we receive it by faith in Chriſts blood, and when we believe we are juſtified by God, and not before; but of this more in what follows.

Excep. Mr. *Eyre.* *Act.* 13. 39. ſhews the priviledge of the Goſpel above the Law, in that Chriſt by one ſacrifice finiſhed our redemption.

Reply. Yet that proves our juſtification by faith, all that believe in Chriſt are juſtified. 2. In ver. 7. All believers were juſtified by Faith in Chriſt. 3. Though ſome great crimes had no ſpecial ſacrifice, yet in ver. 7. Chriſt could ſave them as well as now, and the ſin-offering ſhew'd that Chriſt could purge all ſin.

Gal. 2. 16. plainly proves that we are juſtified by faith, *wee believed that we might be juſtified*; the Apoſtles teach this doctrine in their poſitions, and in their practice.

Mr. *Eyre.* 1. That wee might be juſtified, ſhews not that we are juſtified by faith, but ſo our juſtification is manifeſted, *Mat.* 5. 45. *That you may be the children of your father; (i.e.)* that you may declare your ſelves to be ſuch, &c.

Reply. 1. The queſtion was not, *Gal.* 2. 16. how juſtification might be manifeſted, but how it might indeed be obtained; and the queſtion is, whether we can be juſtified by works or by faith in Chriſt? The Apoſtle proves that wee are juſtified by faith in Chriſt, and not by the works of the Law; and this hee takes for a ſure maxime among Chriſtians, knowing that a man is not juſtified by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Jeſus Chriſt. 2. Hee proves it from the example of the Apoſtles, and converted Jews, we have believed in Jeſus Chriſt that we might be juſtified by the faith of Chriſt. 3 Hee aſſerteth that no man can be juſtified by the works of the Law. 4 Hee confirmeth this doctrine, *Gal.* 3. 6. ſo *Abraham* was juſtified, v. 7, 8, 9. ſo we are children of *Abraham*, and bleſſed with *Abraham*.

S. 3. *Excep.* By Juſtification we are to underſtand a juſtification in the court of the Conſcience, or the evidence of juſtification already paſt before God; ſo that faith is ſaid to juſtifie us, not becauſe it doth juſtifie us before God, but becauſe it doth declare to our conſciences that we are juſtified. Here M. *Eyre* craves patience to declare his opinion, and that I have examined in the firſt Chapter; in a word, the reſult of the 6. & 7. Chapters comes to this: "That Juſtification properly taken is an eter-
"nal and immanent act of God; that yet God did intend this to
"the Elect in and by Chriſt, and that juſtification by faith is all one with
"juſtification

M. Eyre's *Opinion.*

" justification by Christ, and that if faith be taken for our believing, then it " doth justifie us in the court of our conscience, by evidencing it unto us.

My *Reply*. But of this before: Onely let the Reader see, that this Proposition mentioned in the Word, *We are justified by faith*, is by Mr. *Eyre* put into opposite senses; for it is made an eternal act of God, and a temporal act in our consciences, and faith is by him taken subjectively and objectively; but of this in the first, and second and third Chapters. I now pass on.

Mr. *Woodbridge* invades the forementioned Exception.

Reply. 1. So ye contradict the Holy Ghost; for the Apostle to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, asserts the Doctrine of justification by faith, in opposition to justification by works, and he concludes that we are justified by faith in the sight of God, *Rom.* 3. 20, 25. *Gal.* 3. 11. The Apostles Argument is this, If we are justified by faith in the sight of God, then not by works in the sight of God; but we are justified by faith, for the just shall live by faith, *Ergo* not by works.

Excep. of Mr. *Eyre*. In the Apostles dispute, faith is taken objectively for Christ, not for our believing, for she Apostle denying justification by works, would not attribute justification to our faith, sith that is a work of ours.

My Reply. Here I reply. 1. I have proved Chap 3. that Faith in Justification is to be taken for our believing, and it is most manifest, *Rom.* 4. and *Gal.* 2. *we have believed that we might be justified, Mark* 16. 16. *Luk.* 7. 50. *Thy faith hath saved thee, &c.*

2. Faith doth not justifie as a meritorious work, by its own worth, or dignity, but because it doth receive Christ, and doth interest us in him, and so to be justified by faith, and to be justified by works are inconsistent, because we are justified by faith, therefore we are not justified by works, for to be justified by faith in Christ, is to be justified by the righteousness of Christ; to be justified by works, is to be justified by our own righteousness: In this the Law and Gospel differ; in this the Covenant of works and of grace are opposed.

2. *Mr. Woodbr. Reply*. 2. Mr. *Woodbridge* saith, it is an unsound opinion, that faith doth evidence our justification before faith, for faith must evidence it improperly as an effect doth argue the cause, as laughing may evidence reason in a child, or else properly, and that either Axiomatically or Syllogistically.

Exam. Here I interpose. 1. No man will say, that faith will evidence justification before faith; but when a man believes, it will evidence our justification, and that as a signe, for justification being by faith, where is true faith, is justification: other signes of grace are rendred by worthy godly Divines, and they do not put the soule to doubt, but help to settle the doubting Christian.

2. I dare not say, that faith doth not evidence our justification, for we in believing taste how good the Lord is, rejoyce with joy unspeakeable, and glorious; faith acting lively so staies on Christ, as to settle the soule in peace, and joy, and this is the doctrine of the Protestants, as Dr. *Prideaux, lect. de Certitud. salut. &c.* but I omit quotations in a matter so evident.

3. Yet the words, *we are justified by faith*, must not be so taken for the evidencing of it in our consciences, but for justification before God, and herein

we

we differ from Mr. *Eyre*, faith receives Christ, *John* 1.12. and unites to Christ, *Ephes.*3.17.and ſo we feed on Chriſt, *John* 6. and when we are in Chriſt we are juſtified, *Rom.*8 1.*phil.*3.9. Faith yet works to excite love, and in feeding on Chriſt, it brings peace, and joy, and ſo it gives evidence to the ſoule; but the Scripture doth expreſs this peace by other words, and never by juſtification by faith, it is called peace, joy, taſting how good the Lord is, and inward ſealing, *&c.* Yet I muſt ſay with Mr. *Woodbridge*, that many are juſtified, to whom yet this is not evidenced.

Mr. *Woodbridge*. But works do evidence juſtification.

Exam. True; but not ſo ſurely as the operation of a lively faith taſting how good the Lord is.

Mr *Eyre*. If faith be taken in a proper ſence, words do juſtifie, ſo *Baxter* and *Dr. Hammond*.

Exam. 1. Faith juſtifies not as a work, or by its dignitie. 2. If *Dr. Hammond*, and Mr. *Baxter* attribute juſtification to works, let them beare it. 3. I ſhall examine Mr. *Baxters* doctrine in what followeth.

Exam. 1. Mr. *Eyre* ſaith, Faith doth evidence our juſtification by believing the promiſes, and taſting ſweetneſs in believing, and this is moſt true; yet faith doth juſtifie us too, and that by receiving of Chriſt, and after the receiving of Chriſt ſtaying on him followes this inward ſealing, *Epheſ* 1.12.13.

2. Though a man is not in the firſt act of faith to believe that he is juſtified, yet a man is to reſt on Chriſt, and after that to grow ſo in faith, as to have aſſurance that he is juſtified; and thus much briefly in *Exam.* of that which Mr. *Woodbridge* and Mr. *Eyre* have concerning evidencing juſtification by faith.

Mr. *Woodbridge*, *Reply*. So we ſhould be made concurrent Cauſes with God in the formall act of our owne juſtification, and this is contrary to the Scripture which attributes it to God alone *Rom.*8.32. *Rom* 4.6.8. for if juſtification be in our conſciences, then we pronounce our ſelves juſt.

Mr. *Eyre*. The formall act of juſtification is not the pronouncing us juſt this may be done by a Miniſter without robbery to God, that conſiſts in not imputing ſin.

My *Reply*. The juridicall act of God is his ſentence in the Court of the Goſpel, and ſo that ſentence abſolving us we are juſtified, you placing it in the Court of conſcience, attribute our abſolution to that Court, and ſo we juſtifie our ſelves.

In the next place, here is ſome contention about our being paſſive in Juſtification, which might we be ſpared, for I cannot ſee how it may tend to edification. Mr. *Eyre* doth handle that in the 9. Chapter, *pag*: 90. I ſhall interrupt my diſpute in ſtaying on it preſently, I will therefore reſerve that to another Chapter, and ſo paſſe on to the arguments propoſed by Mr. *Woodbridge*, whereby he aſſerteth Juſtification by faith.

1. *Argum.* Mr. *Woodbridge*. No act of grace is declared in the word to be a legall diſcharge of a ſinner in unbeliefe, and therefore no unbeliever is juſtified.

1. *Except.* Mr. *Eyre* the Goſpel is a publiſhed diſcharge of all the elect that Chriſt hath made a perfect attonement for them.

2. Juſtification

2. Justification is not the published declared act of God, but it consists in not imputation of sin, in the breast of God, and that is done before they believe.

My *Reply.* 1. Though the Gospel doth set forth to all, to whom it is revealed, that God laid our sins on Christ, and that all the elect shall be saved, yet that is no discharge to any one that heares the Gospel, there is no promise to build on, no discharge from condemnation to any one that heares it, unless we look to the tenour of the court of grace, whose sentence is, *He that believeth shall be saved*, he that believeth is justified, *&c.* Now such a promise doth not discharge an unbeliever, but leaves him under wrath, *Joh.* 3. 36. *Mark* 16. 16. the law condemnes him for sin, the Gospel for unbelieie.

2. Justification is not Gods immanent act, as before in Chap. 2.

3. Justification is a juridicall act of Gods, as Judge, and therefore it must be in some court, you place it in the court of conscience, as done in time; but we have disproved that, because to be justified by faith, cannot be understood for the inward peace of conscience, but that follows on our justification by faith, it must be therefore in some publick court of God, that may be a signall discharge according to his declared sentence in the word; and sith it cannot be in the court of the law, sith that condemnes, it must be at the tribunall of grace, and so in the court of the Gospel, that condemnes the unbeliever, and it justifies the believer, and therefore no unbeliever is justified, but remaines in the state of damnation.

Mr. *Woodbridge* adds, our justification must be by some promulged act, and by some law, and so it is by the law of faith, (*i.e.*) the Gospel, the law condemnes, and so the Gospel must be that that justifies.

Mr. *Eyre.* If we were justified by our owne righteousnes, there would be no need of a law to justifie us, but not now sith we are justified by the righteousnes of another.

Reply. Yes; we must be justified by a law in the covenant of grace, (*i.e.*) by the law of faith. 1. Because according to the sentence of the Gospel, God doth deale with us. 2. Because no benefit or mercy can be had by any that do not performe what is required in the Gospel. 3. Else we could not believe, unless we had some stable promise to rest on. 4. Else we could not take the shield of faith to fight against Satan, unless we had some sure foundation for our faith.

Mr. *Woodb.* adds, Our condemnation is by the sentence of the Law, so our justification must be by some published declared Act for the discharge from condemnation.

Mr. *Eyre.* Take justification for the thing willed, it doth descend to us by the Law, or Covenant made with Christ; which Covenant, and not the conditional promise, is the Law of faith, because else believers might boast, and Mr. *Woodb.* doth not rightly say, that all whom the Law condemnes are condemned by God.

My *Reply.* It is true, that wee have justification by Christ in that hee our Advocate did undertake our redemption, and performe it, and then God for Christs sake did set up a Court of mercy, wherein the sentence of absolution is a conditional promise, *Joh.* 3. 16. and *Ver.* 36. and *Mark* 16. 16. And,

2. Mr. *Eyre*

2. Mr. *Eyre* cannot weaken this; for boasting is excluded by the Law of faith, by that Law that doth justifie believers, and that because believers are justified by Christs righteousness, and not by their own.

3. Mr. *Wood.* doth say that believers are freed from the condemnation of the Law; yet whom the Law condemns, and the Gospel doth not absolve, are under the wrath of God, *Joh.* 3 36. And that is the condition or state of unbelievers, as *John the Baptist* doth there declare.

8 4 Mr. *Eyre* obj cts, and undertakes to prove, that justification is not the discharge of a sinner by a publisht declared Act.

Ob. 1 Just fication is not by works, therefore not by a publike Act discharging him that perform'd the condition.

Sol. To be justified by works, and to be justified by faith, are inconsistent, *Rom* 3. 28 *Eph.* 2. 8.

Ob. 2 If Justification be by that signal promise, *He that believeth shal be saved*, then none were justified before that sentence was declared; the promises to *Adam*, *Noah* and *Abraham* were absolute, the fathers in us were justified; yet had not any such declared discharge.

Sol. 1. None were justified before that sentence was declared, it was declared to *Adam*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *&c. Abraham* was justified by faith, *Rom* 4; Circumcision sealed to him the righteousness of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. Yet,

2. They had in *Ver.* 7. some promises absolute, but the promises concerning salvation by the Messias were conditional, requiring faith and repentance, *Abraham*, *Job* and *David* believed, and God promiseth mercy and repentance in sundry places; yet the promises in *Ver.* 7. were not so plain.

Ob. 3. So infants could not be justified, they are unable to plead that discharge.

Sol. Yes, they may, because Gods sentence is in force to absolve them, and they can perform the condition of believing, they can believe habitually, *actu primo*, and so they may be justified.

Ob. 5. So a man should justifie himself, because the performing the condition doth justifie him.

Sol. No; *Abraham* believed, and God justified; so we shall be justified, if we believe, *Rom.* 4. and *Gal.* 2. 16. Wee have believed that wee might be justified; who should justifie them? God.

Ob. 4. So God should be accounted but as a Notary, it detracts from his Majesty.

Sol. No; it is Gods law, and Gods sentence, as Judge, and Lord.

Ob. 6 Forgiveness among men may be, though not by a declared discharge; a man forgives when he layes aside thought of revenge, and so God may forgive though he do not declare it.

Sol. 1. A private man may forgive private injuries, and yet not declare it, but yet charitie requires a declaration of it too, in friendly carriage; yet a Magistrate is to forgive by some publike act, or else the pardon is no securitie to the offender.

2. God hath bound himselfe by his owne revealed will, and from that he will not deviate, because he is true and constant, he will save by that meanes,

and

and in that order proposed in his word, they that looke out another way of salvation, are injurious to God: they who submit to Gods owne will revealed do not limit God, but obey him. This is Gods setled rule, *He that believeth shall be saved, He that believeth not shall be damned.*

5. *Argum.* M. *Woodbridge.* They that are under condemnation cannot at the same time be justified; but all the world are under condemnation before faith. *Ergo* none are justified before faith; the *major* is proved, because condemnation and justification are opposite, and contraries, *Rom.* 8. 1. and 33. 34. the *minor* is proved because it is the plaine sentence of Christ, *Joh.* 3. 18. *& vers.* 36.

Except. He is condemned in his conscience, not before God.

Reply Mr. *Woodbridge.* 1. This condemnation is the condemnation of the law, and therefore it is condemnation before God. 2. Condemnation in the conscience is true or false, if true, it is according to the judgment of God, if false, then we may perswade them not to take notice of their sin, till they are in hell. 3. Gods wrath abideth on the unbeliever. 4. Condemnation is opposed to salvation, *Ich.* 3. 17. and must be such a condemnation as is greater then condemnation in our owne consciences, for that may condemne who God absolves.

Mr. *Eyre.* Chap. 11. seeks to answer this argument.

1. *Except.* 1. To the *major.* He that is condemned in one court, may be justified in another; he that is condemned in the law, may be iustified in the Gospel. *Paul, Rom.* 7. 24. 25. cries out, *O wretched man!* and yet he breaks forth into thankfull expressions: the law considers not men as elect, or believers, *&c.*

My *Reply.* 1. We grant what Mr. *Eyre* here saith, and this makes for us, because the law condemnes for sin, but the Gospel absolveth believers.

2. The law and the Gospel too do not meddle with our election, the law looks to our obedience, the Gospel to our faith and repentance, yet our election is declared as the fountain of our spirituall good, but when we come to looke into the word to be justifid, we are not considered as elect, but as believers; and to believers remission of sins is promised; and that confirmes our assertion, that *we are justified by faith, and not before faith.*

Except. Mr. *Eyre* saith to the *minor*, that the elect are not under condemnation. *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect?*

My *Reply.* Though God intend to justifie the elect, yet they are not justified till they believe, nor are they justified as elect, but as believers, God will save all that are elected, but he doth justifie them according to the tenour of his word. *He that believeth shall be saved*, God is as constant in performing his word, as in performing his decrees.

Mr. *Eyre* makes exception against the proofes of the *minor.*

1. *Except, Joh.* 3. 18. *(i. e.)* he that believeth not at all: our Saviour had no intent to shew the state of the elect before believing, but the misery of those that believe not at all.

My *Reply.* 1. Then it thence follows that unbelievers shall be damned, that they were damned too long before by the law: and those that are for presen in

ſtate of unbeliefe, are in ſtate of damnation: and this is the point we prove.

2. Chriſt in propoſing remiſſion of ſins, or juſtification, conſiders men as believers, the elect themſelves muſt believe or elſe not have remiſſion of ſins. Gods decree is ſure, and Gods word is alſo moſt ſure. The elect ſhall be ſaved by faith in Chriſt. *He that believeth not ſhall be damned.*

2. *Except. Joh.3 36.* is to be underſtood of a finall unbeliever, not of an elect perſon before believing, that place proves not that the wrath of God is done away by believing.

My *Reply.* 1. As finall unbeliefe ſeales up damnation, ſo preſent unbeliefe leaves a man in ſtate of damnation: the wrath of God was due for ſin, and was charged in the court of the law, that wrath remaines on an unbeliever, it is not removed in the court of the Goſpell: no, there he findes damnation for unbeliefe: therefore hence the *minor* is confirmed.

2. The wrath of God is done away ſo by faith, that the perſon believing is free from condemnation. *Rom.8.1.* is juſtified in the court of mercy, and alſo deliver'd from the wrath to come.

3. *Except.* Mr. *Eyre. Eph.2.3. they were by nature the children of wrath,* yet Chap.4. *choſen to life.* Mr. *Eyre* ſaith, that the text ſaith not they were under condemnation before converſion, as by nature ſo under wrath, yet by grace they might be children of his love, ſo are all the elect: to elect infants Chriſts righteouſneſs is imputed, and why not to others?

My *Reply.* 1. To be by nature under wrath, is to be in the ſtate of damnation, in an unregenerate eſtate; and ſo to be under condemnation before converſion; and this is that wrath from which Chriſt freeth us, even from *the curſe of the law, Gal.3.* and *from the wrath to come.*

2. Though God intend the good of the elect (*i.e.*) to ſave them from this wrath, yet they are under this curſe till God deliver them; and hence is it that we have cauſe to bleſſe God that we eſcape this damnation, becauſe we were in the ſame damnation, but God called us, united us to Chriſt, and ſaved us through his blood, *Revel.5.9.* and *Revel.7.9.* and verſ.14.

3. The places alledged by Mr. *Eyre* prove not that the elect were juſtified before they believed, we acknowledged that God did ſo love the elect from all eternitie, as to will their good, but this love God ſhewed in freeing them from his wrath, (*i.e.*) from the ſentence of vindicative juſtice, and this he freed them from through faith in Chriſt.

4. To elect infants Chriſts righteouſnes is imputed, and yet not without faith: they have habituall faith, and ſo are in Chriſt, and *Rom* 8.1. no condemnation is to ſuch: ſo to elect men Chriſts righeouſneſs is imputed, (*i.e.*) when they believe, and have put on Chriſt by faith.

Mr. *Eyre* yet goes on, and diſtinguiſheth.

1. The wrath of God either ſignifies the juſt will of God, to deale with ſuch perſons according to the tenour of the law. 2. It notes the comminations of the law. 3. The puniſhments threatned. In the firſt, and laſt ſenſe the elect are not under Gods wrath. The threatnings of the law ſhew not the ſtate of a perſon toward God, but what he is by nature.

My *Reply.* 1. I grant that the elect of God are not under wrath in the ſenſes mentioned,

mentioned, because God hath resolved to deliver them from that damnation which they in time deserve, Yet they are so under wrath as to be condemned in Gods court of justice for their sin: and here is the rich mercy bestowed on them, that God doth deliver them from this damnation, but he delivers them by Christ, and they must be in Christ before this damnation is taken off.

Mr. *Woodbridge* adds as before, to which Mr. *Eyre* opposeth his *Answer*.

1. The condemnation is the condemnation of the law, it pronounceth all guilty.

Mr. *Eyre*. It shewes who are guilty in themselves, but the elect are tried at another barre.

My Reply. Yes; wee grant it, that final damnation doth not seize on them, yet unless they were under condemnation, God did not deliver them from condemnation. 2. That the Elect are tried at another bar we grant, but at that bar the believers are justified, the unbeliveres are condemned.

2. Mr. *Woodbridge*. The condemnation of unbelievers conscience is true, or false, if true, then God condemns also, &c.

Mr. *Eyre*. The conscience witnesseth aright so far as it agreeth with the written word, when it witnesseth concerning guilt of sin, or the desert of sin, then it doth wel, but if it witnes that a man is damned for sin, so it is penally and finally evil; yet if the coscience be erroneous, the consequence which Mr. *Woodbridg* fastneth on it doth not hold, the Law is to be preached so as to drive men to believe, &c.

My Reply. That which Mr. *Eyre* lays down, takes not off the argument, let the Conscience witness according to Gods word, it shews that an unbeliever is in state of damnation, and that as much as we press, we say not that it ought to dispair, but we preach the Law to drive men to Christ; because the Gospel is Gods Court of mercy, dispensing mercy to believers.

3. Mr. *Woodbridge*. The condemnation is, *Gods wrath abideth on him Ioh.* 3. 36.

Mr. *Eyre*. It abideth not on the Elect, but on the finall unbelievers.

My *Reply* Yet it abideth on the elect so as to be charged on him in the Law, and in the Gospel, til he believe, if it were on him, it abideth on him til he believe but it was on him, or else none are delivered from wrath.

4. Mr. *Woodbridge*. Condemnation is opposed to salvation, and that is more then condemnation in ones own conscience.

Mr. *Eyre*. That is damnation; must the Elect be damned? by unbelievers is then meant he that believeth not at all.

My *Reply*. Though the Elect shall not be damned, because God infallibly wil save them, yet they were in the state of damnation by nature, and had so continued if God had not shewed them mercy; whence it follows, that the damnation mentioned is such as is more than in ones own conscience, and yet from this damnation men are delivered by faith in Christ, and sith it is so, we are not justified before faith or without faith.

S. 6. 3. Arg. Mr. *Woodb.* The Brazen Serpent did set forth Christ, the healing by it, our healing by Christ, the looking on that our believing in Christ, they by looking on that were healed, so we by looking on Christ by believing

are justified, *Ioh.*3. & *Ioh.*6. we feed on Christ spiritually by faith to nourish our souls.

Excep. Mr.*Eyre.* Comparisons prove not unless it were the intent of the Holy Ghost to prove so the thing in question; I deny that in either of these comparisons it was the intent of the Holy Ghost to shew in what order or method we are justified in the sight of God.

My *Reply.* It is plain that the Serpent did typifie Christ, their seeing our believing, and their healing our healing; therefore that comparison shews plainly that we are healed by believing in Christ, and because other Scriptures call this justification, hence it follows that this healing is our justification.

2. That *Ioh.*6. plainely notes that we by faith feed on Christ, and so we are the more confirmed that he is ours, dwelleth in us, and we in him, and hence followes that our union with Christ is begun, and continued by faith, and thence it followes that we are justified by believing on Christ, sith they only have benefit by Christ that are united to him.

2. Mr *Eyre* excepts. This stinging of the Serpent shew'd the stinging of the conscience, from which a man cannot be freed till he looke on Christ.

My *Reply.* 1. It is true, so the conscience comes to be eas'd, but what is this ease? that a man is freed from condemnation, and how so? *Luke.*7. *ult. thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace.*

3. *Except.* Mr.*Eyre.* He that looked on the Serpent lived, a vitall act, so they that believe have a vitall act.

Reply. Yes, faith is a vitall act, but it comes presently to Christ, and then the just shall live by his owne faith. *Habac.* 2.

*S.*7. *4. Argum.* Mr.*Woodbridge.* A fourth argument is drawne from the perpetuall opposition between faith, and works, from whence the argument is this, what place and order works had to justification in the covenant of works, the same place and order faith hath to our justification in the covenant of grace, but works were to go before our justification in the covenant of works, *Ergo* faith is to go before justification in the covenant of grace.

1 *Except.* Mr.*Eyre.* Faith hath not the same place in the covenant of grace, as works have in the covenant of works. 1. Because works in the covenant of works are meritorious of eternall life, not so faith in the covenant of grace. 2. Works in the first covenant are the matter of our justification, but faith is not the matter of our justification in the covenant of grace. 3. Then God must account faith to be our perfect righteousnes. 4. So the two covenants would be confounded, for so the covenant of grace were a covenant of works, sith faith is our work. 5 This assertion makes faith to be not of grace, because not from the covenant of grace, seeing the covenant it selfe dependeth on it. Our Divines in former ages have taken faith metonimically, for the object therof.

Exam. 1. I conceive that Mr.*Woodbridge* hath no intent to place faith every way in the second covenant, as works were in the first covenant; yea so much is manifest in his discourse: But as in the first covenant works were to precede justification, so in the second covenant faith is to precede justification; and the first covenant did require works as antecedent to justification, so the second

covenant

covenant doth require that faith precede justification.

2. We confesse that Christs righteousnes is the meritorious cause of our whole salvation, and the matter of our justification, and that Christs righteousnes is the perfect righteousnes that will stand before Gods tribunall, and we acknowledging that Christs righteousnes is imputed to us that believe, distinguish the two covenants, the first did require a perfect righteousnes of our owne, the second doth justifie us by the perfect righteousnes of Christ.

3. Though faith be wrought in us, by preventing grace, and God blesse us with all spirituall blessings in Christ, yet God enters not into covenant with any but with believers, he offers no pardon to any unless they believe, and he justifies none but believers, and so on our part we by faith enter into covenant with God.

4. We do not say that the *τὸ credere* is imputed to us for the fulfilling of the law, and our ancient Protestants did take faith properly for our believing: but of that before.

Mr. *Woodb.* 1. Adds in defence of his *major*, because the new covenant saith, *believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.* 2. Justification by works, and justification by faith are opposed, which would not be, if to be justified by faith were to be taken declaratively.

Except. Mr: *Eyre.*

1. *Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, is not the tenour of the new covenant, for, 1. It is no where called so. 2. *Ferem.* 31. *Heb.* 8. it runs in another straine, that *Rom.* 10 6,9. is not the tenour of the new covenant, it requires confession too, and it shewes how a man may know whether he shall be saved.

2. To be justified by faith, and to be justified by works, are opposed, but then faith must be taken objectively, if faith be taken for our believing, then they are not oppos'd, fith faith in that sense is our work.

My *Reply.* 1. The tenour of the covenant of grace is *believe and repent, and thou shalt be saved:* on these terms salvation is offered, *Joh.* 3. 16. *Mark.* 1. 15 and obtain'd, so it hath been in all ages.

2. That *Ferem.* 31. doth not declare the whole covenant, but that which God will performe: that which on our part is required is declared elsewhere: the Scripture is harmonious.

3. *Joh.* 3. 16. *Mark* 16. 15. 16: *&c.* and so *Rom.* 10. this is shewed, though confession be there added, that is required as a fruit of faith, faith makes up the union.

2. 1. I have already proved that in this point faith is to be taken subjectively and not objectively, and yet we exclude not Christs righteousnes, yet we cannot so understand the word, as to say our believing in Christ is the object of our faith.

2. I have already often answered that objection by which the Papists did invade us, and shew'd that our believing doth justifie us, yet not by its owne merit, and so not as our work, but as uniting us to Christ.

S. 8. *Arg.* 5. 1. *Cor.* 6. 11. Such were some of you, but you are washed, justified, *&c.* now ye are justified, now, not before, and so *Act.* 10. 43. believers shall receive remission of sins.

1. *Except.*

1. *Except. M. Eyre.* The words do not countenance this inference: he ſaith that they were unſanctified, but not that they were not juſtified.

My Reply. Yes they do: if before converſion they were in ſtate of damnation, then they were not juſtified: But they were in the ſtate of damnation, verſ 9,10. ſuch as they were ſhall not inherit the kingdome; but now they are freed from that ſtate, they are juſtified. 2. Juſtification and ſanctification are inſeparable companions; ſo the Proteſtants have conſtantly taught, and the Scripture proves it to us, *Rom.*8.1. 1 *Cor.*6.11. and becauſe in baptiſm pardon of ſin, and renovation are ſealed together: but if not ſanctified in the ſtate of ſin, nor juſtified in that unregenerate ſtate: *Ergo* ſith juſtification and ſanctification are inſeparable companions, no man is juſtified before he believeth, and is converted.

2. *Except. M. Eyre.* They were after their commiſſion juſtified declaratively.

Mr. *Woodb.* argues. 1. So we might ſay they were ſanctified before they were converted. 2. The juſtification they now had, gave them right to the kingdome of God, but that they had not in their unregenerate ſtate, for then in that ſtate they might have been ſaved, though they had not the evidence of their juſtification.

Mr. *Eyre.* 1. They might be juſtified before converſion, though not ſanctified before; for it is a contradiction to ſay, that an unregenerate perſon is ſanctified, that conſiſts in our converſion to God, but our juſtification is in Gods accounting us righteous, and in ſanctification faith is active, in juſtification it is paſſive.

2. Sanctification conſiſts in our conformity with Gods will.

1. The Corinthians by believing had no more right to ſalvation then they had before.

2. It will not follow hence, that they might go to heaven without faith, ſith Chriſt hath purchaſed faith for his people, and God will give them this evidence.

My Reply. 1. If not ſanctified before converſion, not juſtified before it, becauſe the Apoſtle doth joyn theſe as benefits obtained after the preaching of the Goſpel, and ſo they are not to be disjoyn'd.

2. To ſay that an unbeliever is juſtified, is a contradiction in the covenant of grace: A man may as well be ſaid to be ſanctified without holineſs, as to be juſtified without faith, becauſe *he that believeth ſhall not be damned.*

3. Though juſtification be Gods act, yet it is his juridicall act, and God in that will proceed according to the tenour of his Goſpel, becauſe God is true and conſtant.

2. Though the Corinthians were elected before, and redeemed before, yet they believing had right to Gods kingdome. 1. So in Chriſt. 2. So they were ſons, *Ioh.*1 11,12. 3. So eternall life was begun in them. 4. So they had pardon, and *them whom he hath juſtified he hath glorified.*

2. It will follow, that if they had been juſtified before, they might have been ſaved without believing; for *Rom.*8.30. *Whom he hath juſtified he hath glorified:* and men may be ſaved without evidences of ſalvation.

M. *Woodb.*

Mr. *Woodb.* This evidence is of such necessity, as if they have it not, they shall lose eternall life, or no: if not, then whether they believe, or not, they shall be saved: if it be, then there is no absoute justification before faith, but justification is conditionall.

Except. Mr. *Eyre* retorts. 1. So all other works of sanctification must be conditions of our justification. 2. So absolute election would be overthrown. 3. Election and justification are absolute, as to have no antecedent conditions, not so absolute as to have no consequences.

My Reply. 1. Our justification is not attributed to other works, and so this retortion will not hold. We are justified by faith in Christ, but we may be saved and justified without evidence of justification; and therefore it is more then evidencing it is justification before God on which eternall life doth follow.

2. That election is not *ex fide prævisa*, for faith foreseen we grant, but the Scriptures prove that we are justified by faith, and not before faith, or without faith; and therefore the arguing is not good. We were chosen that we might be holy, but we are justified when we believe, yet no elect person can be saved, or justified without faith.

3. Justification and election are not well rank'd together. they are not of the same nature: for election is an eternall act of God, justification is his act in time. Christs merits are not the cause of our election, yet they are the cause of our justification. God did elect us that we might believe, God doth justifie us when we believe: the fruits of election intervene betweene that, and our glorification, and justification is one fruit of election. *Rom.* 8.30. yet we attaine to it by faith in Christ.

CHAP. VI.

Wherein the objections are answered.

S. 1. I Have handled some of the objections before, *Chap.* 2.3.4. when I come to them I shall note it, and the Reader may remember it. I now come on to the first objection mentioned by Mr. *Woodbridge*, and handled by Mr. *Eyre*. *Chap.* 13 *pag* 123.

Ob. 1. *Matt.* 3.17. *Rom.* 5.10. the force is, God was well pleased with Christ, or in Christ, and we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.

Mr. *Woodb. Answer.* 1. To *Matt.* 3.17. this well-pleasednes of God is not to be extended beyond the person of Christ, yet if it be extended further, then it imports that God is well pleased with those in Christ, with whom he is well pleased: for *Heb.* 11.6. without faith it is impossible to please God.

Mr. *Eyre* goes on and argues. 1. Interpreters extend this well-pleasedness to all for whom Christ was a mediator. 2. It is against the scope of the words, to limit them to Christs person. 3 God was never displeased with Christ. 4. This wel-pleasedness is to be extended to all those for whom Christ offered up himself.

Mr. *Eedes.* I grant, that God was well-pleased in Christ with all his for whom Christ did offer up himself: yet hence you prove not what you intend;

(*i.e.*)

(*i.e.*) you prove not that God was so well-pleased with them as to justifie them before they did believe. God did owne, and accept Christ as their mediator, yet though God did owne Christ as their mediator yet they were not actually existing in him, nor had they part in Christ to be justified by him till they did believe: for *without faith it is impossible so to please God.*

Mr. *Eyre* adds, that *Heb* 11.6. the Apostle speaks of Gods well-pleasednes of their works, and actions, and not of their persons. Gods well-pleasednes with the elect is the immediate effect of Christs death.

Mr. *Eedes.* I grant that God is well pleased with us in Christs death, yet he is not so well pleased with us as to justifie us till we believe. 1. Because he promiseth to us remission of sins on believing. 2. Because faith unites to Christ, and without union no communion in Christs merits. 3. God imputs righteousnes to men believing. 4 God in his word denounceth damnation to all that are impenitent, and in state of unbelief.

2. I add, if mans actions cannot please God without faith, then mens persons cannot be justified without faith: for when the person is accepted, the actions are accepted, when the actions are not accepted, the person is not accepted, the actions cannot please God without faith, then not the persons.

Rom 5.10. *When we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son.*

Mr. *Woodbridge* Christs death was the price of our reconciliation, in him we are reconciled when we are reconciled.

Mr. *Eyre* argues. 1. It is said, *we are reconciled*, not we *shall be.* 2. If our reconciliation were on conditions, we should more cause it than Christ. 3. We were *reconciled when enemies.* 4. Christ did not only pay the price of reconciliation, but also God did not impute our sins. 2. *Cor.* 5.19. 5. If Christ paid the price, then we are justified, the debtor is discharged.

Mr. *Eedes.* 1. There is in Scripture mention of a double reconciliation, one virtuall, the other actuall: 2. *Cor.* 5.19. the virtuall reconciliation is by Christs death, the actuall is by Christs death too, yet after we believe. So *God was in Christ reconciling the world.* (*i.e.*) receiving satisfaction at Christs death; yet *we beseech you be reconciled.* (*i.e.*) believe in Christ, and so be in him to have the merit of Christs death actually imputed to you.

2. 1. To Mr *Eyre.* I grant that there was then virtuall reconciliation, but yet our justification was to be in our severall generations when we should believe.

2. Our virtuall reconciliation was without conditions on our part, but that we may be in Christ, and be reconciled actually, we must believe.

3. We were *reconciled when enemies*, Christ paid the price of our redemption then.

4. God is said not to impute our sins, when Christ paid the price of our redemption, in so much that he did accept of that satisfaction, yet he is said to impute righteousnes to believers, and to absolve sinners when they believe, so owning them as in Christ, and imputing Christs merits to them.

5. Though the price was paid, yet the debter is not discharged, because God did so covenant as to discharge us, when we should be in Christ by faith, and not before, and none else, *John* 3.16.

Mr. *Woodbridge*

Mr. *Woodb.* hath a distinction out of *Grotius*, which considers God, 1. At enmitie, 2. Appeasable, 3. Appeased 1. At enmitie. before the consideration of Christs death, though not averse from all wayes of reconciliation. 2. Appeasable, after the consideration of Christs death, and doth promise to be reconciled. 3. Appeased after the consideration of Christs death and our believing.

Mr. *Eyre* invades it. 1. As opposing Gods simplicitie, omniscience, and immutabilitie. 2. Because no reason can be given of the will of God, nor no temporall thing the cause of what is eternall.

Exam. 1. We make no alteration in Gods will, nor do we assigne any cause of Gods will out of God; yet God doth some things for such causes. *Arquinus Deus propter hoc facit hoc*; and Dr. *Twisse, respectu volitorum*, in regard of the things willed God doth this for this, so Christ is the authour of our salvation, though not of our election. Why God would elect this man, and not that man we know no cause, congruence, or condition out of God, and assigne none, but the divine good pleasure, who hath *mercy on whom he will*; yet why God will save this man, we can assigne a cause, and that is because Christ died, and because he is in Christ by faith, for these are of God appointed meanes of salvation.

2. To the distinction, *God was at enmitie with sinners*, (*i.e.*) the sin was repugnant to the law, and made them obnoxious to damnation, and if Christ had not died non could have been saved, but as *Bede, Christ took away the sin that caused the enmitie*, and so when Christs death was considered, and not performed, because it should in due time be performed, God gave out a promise to the fathers in the Old Testament and because Christs death entended was in force they had actuall reconciliation then, and now Christs death is accomplished it doth save now, but according to the tenour of the Gospel it saves those which believe and repent, and thus this is according to the tenour of the word the rule of our faith.

3. We do not fancy in God a change from love to hatred, or from hatred to love, but we say God will'd the best good to the elect, yet so as to bestow it on them in Christ, and to make them accepted in his well-beloved son, and so Christ died to save all in the Old Testament and in the New Testamen that should believe in him.

Mr. *Eyre* invades that of Mr. *Woodbridge*, wherein he placeth force in the word *now*; *now we are justified*: and here, 1. The word *now*, 1. *Cor.* 15. 20. *Ephes.* 22. doth not note that the thing mentioned was not before. 2. Though we now received it by faith, yet our attonement, was made before; the tipicall sacrifices obtaind a present attonement, much more the reall, *Heb.* 9. 12.

Mr. *Eedes.* 1. The word now in this place hath the force Mr. *Woodbridge* affirmes. 1. Because we were enemies, but now are justified, but how? *Rom* 5. 1. *by faith*, so we are justified, so we have peace. 2. Because reconciliation was obtain'd before, but not applied before, because we were then enemies (*i.e.*) *alas in from the common weale of Israel, yet now we are justified*, and now have peace, (*i.e.*) actuall reconciliation.

2. We grant that virtuall reconciliation was before, but present attonement

was then obtain'd when we believed, as in the Old Teſtament the believing Jew had preſent attonement when he offer'd ſome typicall ſacrifice, becauſe that did lead him by faith, to Chriſt, whoſe death was then not performed, but tipified

Mr. *Woodbridge* His meaning is, that through the death of Chriſt it is that the promiſe of reconciliation is made, by and according to which we are actually reconciled to God after we believe, ſuitable to that *Mat.* 26. 28. the ground of all this is, becauſe the death of Chriſt was not *ſolutio ejuſdem*, but *tantidem*, not the paiment of that which was in the obligation, but of the equivaent, being not the paiment of the debtour, but of the ſuretie.

Mr. *Eyre* invades this.

1. So you conceit Chriſts death procured no certaine or immediate effect at all, for notwithſtanding his death, none might be ſaved, ſith the condition might be performed or not performed: the utmoſt that is aſcribed to Chriſts death, is that he hath obtain'd a ſalvability for ſinners, which the Papiſts conceit is thus. He hath merited that we might merit eternall life. The Arminians, he hath made God placable, but not appeaſed.

Exam. 1 Before Chriſt came God gave out the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins, and a throne of grace was erected, which did grant pardon to believers, and the reaſon is rendred, he was *a Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world*: his death was in force then to ſave, yet it ſaved none but believers. Before Chriſt was exhibited, they were juſtified. 2. Yet Chriſt offering up himſelfe, paid the price of their deliverance, or redemption of the Patriarks that were juſtified by his death before it was accompliſhed, and alſo of our redemption, *on whom the ends of the world are come*: and he is *Jeſus Chriſt, the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever. Heb.* 13. 8. Before his death none were ſaved but believers, and ſo ſince his death none elſe are ſaved 3. Yet the death of Chriſt hath a certain effect, and an immediate effect, for that infinite merit is the eternall righteouſneſs, ſaving the whole people of God, and it is availeable to ſave all men whatſoever, ſo that they believe, *Joh.* 3. 16. 4. The death of Chriſt did merit grace for the elect, by which they infallibly ſhould be ingraffed into him by faith, and perſevere, and be ſaved, and ſo the condition propoſed ſhall be performed by the elect, and they ſhall in Gods due time be called, juſtified, and glorified. 5. So we owne Chriſts merits, and diſclaime our merits, ſo the Papiſts doe not: and we acknowledge ſuch effects of Chriſts death which the Arminians do not, yet we muſt ſay that the elect of God ſince Chriſts death have not actuall, and complete enjoyment of the benefits of his death: and this I will briefly confirme. 1 They are all borne in ſin, *Eph.* 2. 1. 2, &c. 2. They are under the curſe of the law while they are in the ſtate of nature. 3. After converſion they have ſin remaining in them. 4. They are ſubject to many outward afflictions, and to many inward terrours. 5. They at laſt die, and after a ſad life, and a painfull death, attaine to glory. 6. Yea the body lies in the grave in a low condition till the reſurrection: now we muſt know that Chriſts meritorious death did obtaine for them all good things, and God accepted it as meritorious of all the ſpirituall and eternall bleſſings; yet God doth deliver them in their ſeverall generations, and imparts to them the benefits of Chriſts death by degrees. 1. The ſentence of the law is kept off from being executed.

2. God

2. God beares with much long ſuffering till they are converted. 3. God in his due time gives them preventing grace, and ingraffes them into Chriſt by faith, and ſo they are freed from the dominion of ſin, and from the malediction, being juſtified by faith in Chriſt, and ſanctified by regenerating grace. 4. God gives them the ſecond aid, and ſo by degrees mortifies ſin remaining, and in the end at death doth caſt out corruption, and conſummate grace. 5. God in his due time frees them from all woe and miſerie, frees them from mortalitie, & makes them for ever happie in the beatificall viſion, and full fruition of God.

Mr. *Eyre* diſputs thus.

1. The Scripture no where ſaith that Chriſt died to obtaine a conditionall, grant, that we performing the condition might be reconciled to God, but to obtaine peace, and reconciliation it ſelfe, 1. *Dan.* 9. 24. *Coloſ.* 1. 20. *Eph.* 2. 14. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Mat.* 26. 28. 2. So his death had been no more available to the elect than to reprobates. 3. So men ſhould do more for their ſalvation than Chriſt did. 4. So Chriſt ſhould die in vaine, or without any determinate end, if he had any determinate end, it was becauſe he ſaw that the elect would believe by the good uſe of nature, and ſo he joynes with the Papiſts and the Arminians; or elſe becauſe he will give them faith, and ſo he obtain'd by his death more than a conditionall promiſe.

Exam. 1. We ſay not that Chriſts death obtained meerely a conditionall promiſe, but of that before, *Pag.* 29.

2. To the firſt I ſay, that that *Joh.* 3. 16. is a moſt plaine conditionall grant, God gave Chriſt, that whoſoever believes ſhould be ſaved, and ſo other places which I omit.

3. To the ſecond: Chriſt died ſpecially for the elect, to obtaine for them pardon, and grace.

4. To the third: we attribute the whole merit to Chriſt, and we believe by his gift and aid.

5. To the fourth: Chriſt had a determinate end to pay a ſufficient price for all, and to obtaine for the elect pardon, and grace, and glory, yet ſo that remiſſion ſhould be preach'd to them and ſought by them through faith in Chriſt.

Mr. *Eyre* invades Mr. *Woodbridge*, who ſaith, that the death of Chriſt was *ſolutio tantidem*, not *ejuſdem*.

Mr. *Eedes*. But I think that not materiall: I have ſhew'd already, *Page.* 29. that the elect have not preſent actuall enjoyment of the benefits of Chriſts death, but they have them communicated to them in their generations by degrees. Yet I muſt ſay, that Chriſt was our ſuretie, and of Gods providing, not of our owne obtaining, and ſo the benefits of his death were to be impartted to us according to the pleaſure of God: and of that in the next place.

Mr. *Woodbridge*. But the Father, and the Son have agreed betweene themſelves, that none ſhould have actuall reconciliation by the death of Chriſt till they do believe, *Joh.* 6. 40. *Gal.* 5. 4. 1. *Joh.* 5. 11. 12.

Mr. *Eyre*. 1. Shew us this agreement, the Scriptures mentioned prove it not, for *Joh.* 6. 40. ſhewes who ſhall be ſaved, (*i. e.*) they that believe, *Gal.* 5. 24. ſhews that Chriſt ſhall profit us nothing if we ſeeke righteouſneſs in circumciſion or any thing elſe.

That that *Gal.*5.6. doth not ſhew what it is that doth juſtifie us; but what are the exerciſes of divine worſhip, that 1. *Joh.*5.11. is to be underſtood of finall unbeliefe.

Exam. 1. That agreement is ſhew'd, you will not owne it, that *Joh.*6.40. *Gal.*5.6. 1.*Joh.*5.11. prove it, and ſo abundance of other Scriptures, *Joh.*3.16. 17.18. and verſ. 36.

2. If none but believers ſhall be ſaved, none but believers are juſtified, becauſe all that are juſtified ſhall be glorified. 3. The places mentioned ſhew not only who ſhall be ſaved, but how they ſhall be ſaved; *Iob.* 3.16 *Marke* 1.15.

4. Never was any tender of ſalvation made to any, but on ſuch condition. God never did offer ſalvation in the Old Teſtament or in the New Teſtament, but on condition of faith.

5. No man can be ſaved by Chriſt, unleſs he be in Chriſt, for we are ſaved by Chriſt as being of his myſticall body, but we receive Chriſt by faith, *Joh.* 1.12. we *dwell in him by faith*, *Joh.*6. he dwells in us by faith. *Epheſ.*3.17.

Mr. *Woodbridge.* It cannot be proved, that Chriſts death is available to the immediate, and actuall reconciliation of ſinners, without any condition to be perform'd on their part.

Mr. *Eyre.* It is proved. 1. Becauſe Chriſt gave himſelfe a ranſome for the elect, *Iob.*27. *Heb.*5.10.

2. This ranſome was a full, adequate, and perfect ſatisfaction, *Heb.*1.3. &c.

3. That God accepted it.

4. In that ſo they are free'd from the curſe of the law, &c.

Exam. 1. All this proves not the point in queſtion. We grant that Chriſt is the ranſome, and that the ranſome is full, and accepted, and ſo we are freed from the curſe of the law: but yet where is it proved, that we are not bound to faith and repentance to obtain ſalvation, or that theſe things are not required of us? yea, or that the law doth not condemne the elect in the ſtate of unbeliefe?

2. *Page.*29. I have ſhewed, that the elect have not actuall enjoyment of the benefits of Chriſts death, but God imparteth it to them by degrees in their generations. Now I come to ſhew why God doth ſo order it.

1. So their deliverance doth the more manifeſtly appeare to Gods glorie: the curſe of the law ſeizeth on them, on *Adam*, and on all his poſteritie, and originall ſin invadeth all, the elect as well as Reprobats: that all that are ſaved may the more acknowledge from what miſerie they are delivered.

2. As *Adam* was a publike perſon, in whom all fell, and his tranſgreſſion ſeizeth on all his off-ſpring that are from him by naturall generation, even ſo Chriſt the ſecond *Adam* is a publike perſon, and his merit is available to all that are ſpiritually from him, and members of his myſticall body: Chriſt that was from *Adam*, yet born by ſpeciall diſpenſation, and not by naturall generation, had no ſin imputed to him: thoſe ſons of *Adam* that are not from Chriſt, borne of God, have not his righteouſneſs imputed to them.

3. God though he offer'd grace to the elect to convert them, yet he calls them to be converted, and to believe: and he requires faith, to our juſtification, becauſe that ſeeks ſalvation from Gods mercy through Chriſts merits, and unites to Chriſt, and ſo excludeth boaſting.

4. God

4. God calls to repentance, and requireth, and worketh holineſs in his people, becauſe he will ſo manifeſt his mercy, as to maintaine the honour of his holineſs, yet he frees them from ſin by degrees, to let them know ſtill how much they owe to God.

§. 2. Mr. *Eyre* Chap. 14. *p.* 138. enters into a diſpute concerning the covenant between the Father, and the Son, about the immediate effects of Chriſts death. I confeſſe that it is a matter of concernment, and will conduce much to open the point controverted. I intend God willing to follow him, and to examine the objections made by him, and the more willingly, becauſe I have not met with the like before, but of that in the next page.

Q. *Whither Chriſts death be available to the immediate and actuall reconciliation, and juſtification of the elect without any condition performed on their part?*

I have handled this point Chap. 4. I then had not met with theſe objections, the reader may eaſily turne to the Chapter.

1. *Ob.* Mr. *Eyre.* 1. There is no ſuch thing written.

Sol. Mr. *Eedes.* There is: For, 1. Thoſe places of Scripture that ſhew God required faith in the Old Teſtament, ſhew that that was the condition on our part required. So *Abraham*, &c. were juſtifi'd, *Rom.* 4. and circumciſion ſealed this covenant the righteouſneſs of faith.

2. Circumciſion, and the Paſchall Lambe, and other Sacramentary types, and ſacrifices did prove this to the Jewes, for circumciſion was a ſeale of Gods covenant, *Gen.* 17. and it ſealed the righteouſneſs of faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. And the paſchall lambe did typifie Chriſt, and their feeding on that ſet forth the ſpirituall feeding on Chriſt by faith; and in the other ſacramentary types, 1. *Cor.* 10 they dranke of the ſpirituall rock that followed them, and that rock was Chriſt.

3. The promiſes of grace in the Old Teſtament, which ſet forth how God enters into covenant with men are not abſolute but conditionall, *Ezek.* 33. 11. *Eſa.* 55. 5. 6. 7. 8. theſe promiſe mercy and repentance, and repentance, and faith are joynd, *Pſal.* 51. in *Davids* practice, and by Chriſt, *Mark* 1. 15. and in the New Teſtament, *Luke* 13. 3. 5. and 24. 45. repentance, and remiſſion of ſins muſt be preacht together.

4. In the New Teſtament we are invited to believe on Chriſt, *Mat.* 11. 28 *Joh.* 14. 1. 2. 3. and called to believe that ſo we may obtaine part in Chriſt, yea remiſſion of ſins ſo, *Iob.* 3. 16. *Act.* 13. 38. 39.

5. The word of God teſtifies that by faith in Chriſts blood we are juſtified, ſo *Rom.* 3. 25. that we are ſo ſaved, *Eph.* 2. 8. yea that ſo we have ſalvation indeed, *Luke.* 7. 50 thy faith hath ſaved thee.

6. It teſtified that none but believers ſhall be ſaved, yea the ſentence of the Goſpel condemneth unbelievers, *Marke* 16. 16. *Iob.* 3. 36.

7. It ſhews that by faith we receive Chriſt, *Iob* 1. 12 that our communion with him ſo as to be juſtified by him, depends on our union, *Rom.* 8. 1. *Joh.* 6. *Phil.* 3. 9. *&c.*

8. By looking on Chriſt the Jew was ſaved and that was typified by beholding the Braſen Serpent, *Iob.* 3. *Abraham* ſaw Chriſts daies, and belived, and it was imputed to him to righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 4. The ſacraments in the Old Teſtament

Teſtament and in the New Teſtament ſhew that the ſigne muſt be fed on, or it doth not nouriſh, and ſo Chriſt muſt be fed on by faith, or he will not ſave us.

9 Chriſt healing bodily infirmities required of them faith, ſo teaching us that we muſt believe on Chriſt, or we cannot have him to be our ſouls Saviour. This on the ſuddain may ſerve to take off that confident objection, and we may retort it. 'T is written, yea it is the great thing that is written, that we are ſaved, and juſtified by faith in Chriſts blood.

Ob. 2. The covenant between God, and Chriſt was that upon giving up himſelfe to death he ſhould purchaſe to himſelfe a ſeed like the Stars of Heaven, *Iſay.* 53. 10. and *Heb.* 1. 13. and they could not be children of God, while under wrath.

Sol. We grant, that Chriſt dying bought the Church, and ſo purchaſed a ſeed, yet he was to waſh it with water, and the word, *Eph.* 5. he that bought it was to cleanſe it with the word, and with baptiſme, which ſets forth remiſſion of ſins by faith in Chriſt.

2. The words which were ſpoken by *Iſay*, ch. 8. 18. are applied by the Apoſtle to prove the humane nature of Chriſt, becauſe he calls us brethren and children.

3. an elect child is under wrath ſo as to be condemned in the Court of the Law, and of the Goſpel, till he believe, we receive our ſon-ſhip by faith, *Joh.* 1. 12.

3. *Ob.* It was Gods will that Chriſts death ſhould be the full ſatisfaction for all our iniquities, and therefore our diſcharge thereby was to be immediate.

Sol. We grant that Chriſt made full ſatisfaction, yet we denie that we have an immediate diſcharge, we receive not all the benefits of Chriſts death, till after the reſurrection of the dead.

Mr. *Eyre.* The diſcharge of our debts, and deliverance from puniſhment muſt needs be preſent and immediate upon the paiment of the price, though thoſe ſpirituall bleſſings were not received till a long time after.

Sol. 1. This is ſaid, not proved: conſider that believers were ſaved by Chriſt before paiment was made, ſo in the Old Teſtament. 2. Conſider that juſtification, and ſanctification are inſeperably joyn'd, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. and ſealed together in baptiſme. 3. There is no more reaſon that we ſhould be juſtified ever ſince Chriſt died, then that we ſhould be ſanctified and glorified by his death aſſoone as perform'd: for Chriſts death did merit grace, and glory for us, yet we muſt ſtay for both till Gods due time, Chriſt alſo did merit for us juſtification, yet we muſt ſtay for it till we believe.

4. *Ob.* Nothing hindred the reconciliation of the elect but ſin, and that Chriſt took away and ſatisfied the law. *Ergo* ſith Chriſt made ſatisfaction, the elect are then juſtified.

Sol. 1. Did ſin hinder the reconciliation of the elect, how then were they juſtified *ab æterno?*

2. Chriſt ſatisfied Gods juſtice, accepting ſatisfaction from a mediatour, the law did looke for ſatisfaction from our ſelves in our own perſons. Yet ſo Chriſt freed us from the curſe of the law.

3. You

3. You aske then, what hinders from actuall reconciliation? you will wonder at my answer, I will tell you the Gospel hinders it, for God will pardon according to the tenour of the Gospel, in that God dispenseth this pardoning mercy, and in that he pardoneth none but believers.

5. *Ob.* The sin of *Adam* did immediately over-spread all man-kind, and therefore the righteousnes of Christ did descend immediately on the elect.

Sol. 1. We are from *Adam* by naturall generation, from Christ by spirituall regeneration. *Adam* stain'd his nature in his owne person, and stain'd the fountain of mans nature, *Adam* had a guilt, that would fall on all that did descend from him by natural generation, yet the guilt and corruption of nature were to descend together, and so we are borne sinners liable to wrath. Christ as our head cleans'd the Church so in the head, that from him righteousnes, and holines should flow down to us: but they come together, justification & sanctification are not to be seperated, & they descend on us when we are born again.

6. *Ob.* The sacrifices of the law were available immediately for tipicall cleansings, but those made attonement without conditions; therefore much more Christs sacrifice makes an immediate attonement.

Sol. The typicall cleansings led them to spirituall cleansings, and those were not obtain'd without faith, in the Old Testament, because in the Old Testament they were saved by faith.

7. *Ob.* Elect infants are reconciled without conditions, therefore elect men are justified without conditions.

Sol. Elect infants have habituall faith.

Instant. 1. They have no knowledge. 2. They cannot heare the word, or not understand it; therefore they have no faith.

Sol. Habituall faith may be without knowledge; that infants are capable of habituall faith, I prove.

1. Christ an infant was head of the Church, and filled with all grace. 2. If *Adam* had not sinned all infants had been endow'd with originall righteousnes. 2. Infants are capable of originall sin, infancy then is capable of regenerating grace. 4. God in the Old Testament commanded that infants should be circumcised, and that was the *seale of the righteousnes of faith*: this God would not have done, if that age had been altogether uncapable of faith. 5. *John Baptist* was sanctified in the wombe, and then it is plaine that he believd; though not actually, yet habitually: Gods Spirit sowes in them the seeds of grace, and regeneration cannot be without habituall faith.

8. *Ob* It is Gods will that Christ should have the whole glory of our reconciliation; conditions share with him in the glory.

Sol. Conditions of Gods making detract not from Christ; he that will be saved must goe Gods way to heaven.

9. *Ob.* We cannot have firme peace; if it depend on conditions to be perform'd by our selves.

Sol. Rom. 5. 1. *Being justified by faith we have peace with God. Eph.* 1. 12. 13. *In whom after ye believed ye were sealed.* 1. *Pet.* 1. 8. *believing ye rejoyce with joy unspeakeable, and glorious.*

10. *Ob.* If our justification did depend on conditions, they could not have it before death, because perseverance is required.

Sol

Sol. A true saving faith justifies, and it will hold out to the end. Perseverance must precede glorification, faith preceeds justification.

11. *Ob.* Conditions may not be perform'd, and so such may not be saved.

Sol. The elect shall certainly in Gods time believe: yet let all know, that he that finally remaines in unbeliefe, shall be damned.

12 *Ob.* If God willed the salvation of the elect but conditionally, he did will their damnation conditionally.

Sol. God did will the salvation of the elect by faith in Christ, and he gave Christ to merit grace, and pardon, yet his sentence is, *He that believeth shall be saved.*

13. *Ob.* So God should see some good in them which Christ hath not merited.

Sol. 1. The Arminians make a loud noise against us, because we say that God enables man to doe that which he requireth; yet we feared it not, in 2. We constantly say, that Christ merited grace for us: Christ did not die for us on condition we would believe, but salvation by Christs death is offered to us if we believe, and we are justified by faith in his blood.

14. *Ob.* Our sins were imputed to Christ without conditions on our part. *Ergo* his righteousnes to us without conditions; for the charging of them on Christ was our discharge.

Sol. 1. It holds not; for our sins were charged on Christ, because he became our Mediatour, yet so our Mediatour, that then we should have pardon by his blood when we believe, *Ioh.3.16. &c.*

2. So Christs bearing our sins doth discharge us, that we need no other satisfaction to be made, yet we must seeke to have part in his satisfaction that is made, or we shall perish. *He that believeth not shall be damned.*

15. *Ob.* Some testimonies of Scripture prove it, *Colos.*1. 14. *Eph.*1.7. *Heb.* 9 12. 2 *Cor.*5.17.18.19. *Heb.*1.3. *Heb.*10.14. *Colos.*2.10.13.14. *Rom.*8. 33.34.

Sol. 1. These places prove that by Christs death the full price of our redemption is paid, and that his blood can purge us. But they prove not that we are justified, or actually reconciled without faith, or before faith: the first is not in question, the second cannot be so proved.

S. 3. 2. That. 2 *Cor.*5.18.19. and *Rom.*8.33. hath been handled before.

Ob. Mr *Eyre* goes on, and disputeth, Chap15. *Page.*146. that I have handled Chap.4. and Chap.17. *Psal.*15.7. is a dispute concerning our being in covenant with God before believing, and that I may take the more roome to cleare it, I will handle that in the next Chapter.

CHAP. VII.

Whether we can be in Covenant with God before we Believe?

I Hold it expedient to insist on this; and that I may clear the Point the more, it will be expedient, 1. To shew what a Covenant is. 2. To consider the two great Covenants that God made with men. 3. To enquire what Covenant God made with Christ. 4. To consider what is the Covenant of grace that God made with man fallen. 5. To enquire concerning the Covenant made with the people of Israel, and the New Covenant promised *Jer.* 31. and mentioned *Heb.* 8. 10. I begin with the first.

Q. *What is a Covenant?*

A. 1. A Covenant properly so called is a mutual stipulation passing between two distinct persons, or between more, on one side, or on both sides: So that it may be between two, and but two; or one may covenant with more, or one City or Nation may covenant with another City or Nation: So *Abraham* made a covenant with *Abimelech*, *Gen.* 21. 32. *Jacob* with *Laban*, *Gen.* 31. 44. *David* with the people of Israel, 2 *Sam.* 5. 3. and so the Covenant that is made between God and men, is a mutual stipulation, wherein God is pleased to promise to man such blessings, and man is bound to such duties.

2. Yet sometimes a promise made by one party either out of grace, or out of duty, may be called a Covenant, being a binding promise; and so God did promise to keep off a general Deluge *Gen.* 9. 12, 13, 16. and so *Jer.* 34. the people did enter into Covenant to do that which God had commanded, in releasing their servants.

Q. 2. *What are the two great Covenants that God made with men?*

A. They are the two Covenants that God made with men concerning man's salvation; The first was made with *Adam* innocent: The second was made with *Adam* fallen. The first was a covenant of works, promising eternal happiness on obedience; the second was a covenant of grace, promising mercy and salvation on faith in the Messias. The first Covenant God the good Creator made with man innocent, and that of his goodness; for man owed God obedience for the benefit of Creation, and God owed him no reward; yet God was pleased to extend his goodness so far as to promise and assure man of happiness on obedience: Nor was the Covenant of works rigorous to man innocent; the holy Angels that persisted in their native integrity, obtained by their obedience that blisse that was proposed to *Adam*, and promised on obedience. To us since the fall, the commands of that Covenant are impossible, because Original guilt hath invaded us; Original justice is lost, and corruption hath depraved us; yet man is not freed from the obligation of that Covenant; the Commands reach us, sith we owed obedience to the Law for the benefit of Creation; and the curse deserved by the breach of that Law doth pursue us all; in this state our sin hath set us, and in this damnable con-

dition God might have left us; by this covenant we cannot be saved, our sin doth hinder it. For this doth require Obedience exact, and in our own persons, nor doth this covenant afford mercy on our repentance.

The other covenant of grace is a covenant founded on the blood of Christ, granting an appeal from the Law to the Gospel; from Gods justice, to his mercy; And here the question is not whether man hath obeyed, or not, but whether such an one doth believe and repent; the Law condemns for sin, the Gospel for impenitence and unbelief. *He that believeth not shall be damned.*

Q. 3. *Whether God made a Covenant with Christ, and what that Covenant was?*

A. That there was a mutual agreement between God the Father, and God the Son, or between God the blessed Trinity, and Christ our Mediator concerning the means and manner of our salvation, is a truth plainly revealed in the Scripture.

1. God is said to give, to send his Son; *John* 3. 16, 17. God gave, and set forth, and sealed his Son, and he was called of God as *Aaron*, *Heb.* 5.

2. God the Son willingly of his infinite goodnesse undertook to be our Advocate and mediator, *Ps.* 40. 6, 7, 8. *Then said I, lo I come. Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8. *John* 10. *I laid down my life of my self.* So he undertook to be incarnate, and to perform those things that were needful for our salvation.

3. God did require of Christ our mediator exact obedience, and full satisfaction to his justice, that he for us, as our mediator, should pay an infinite meritorious price for our redemption, and should merit for us all the good things that concern our salvation: And Christ did undertake this, and perform it, *Isa.* 52. 5, 6, 7. *Gal.* 3. 13. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. *Heb.* 9. 12, 13, 14.

4. Christ our Advocate did merit grace and pardon for the Elect, who were given to him by the Father, that he might save them; and he hath received power as our Advocate to give to them eternal life; *John* 17. 2, 3. and *Rom.* 6. 23. and *Eph.* 1. 3. *God doth bless us with all spiritual blessings in Christ.* Yet sith Christ suffered in our Nature, and sith his person was so glorious and great, and sith salvation is to be preached to all in his Name, he would that his death should be sufficient to save all whatsoever; so that all to whom the Gospel is preached, may rest upon him, as a Saviour, able to save all that will come unto him, *Heb.* 7. 25.

Q. *But was the Covenant of grace made with Christ, or the same Covenant made with him that is made with us?*

A. 1. Christ our mediator properly is the foundation of the covenant of grace, sith the covenant of grace was erected and granted to us for his merits: the covenant of grace as proposed to us presupposeth his merits, and on that it is built, *Gen.* 3. 15. though Christs death was not yet accomplished, yet that was able to save them, and did save all the faithful in the old Testament; and so now, when any are invited to enter into covenant with God, Christs merits is presupposed, and in and through him the Salvation is preached.

2. The

2. The Scripture doth ſet forth to us, that the covenant of Grace is ratified and confirmed, and ſo founded on his blood, *Matth.* 26. *This is my blood*, &c. it ſhews that ſome agreement concerning our ſalvation paſſed between God and Chriſt, yet it doth not call that the covenant of grace, nor ſay in any place that God made the ſame covenant with Chriſt that he made with us; and though Chriſt be the Head of the Church, and the cauſe of our ſalvation, yet we and Chriſt are not in the ſame covenant; but we by vertue of his merits have a Court of mercy granted, and a covenant of grace held forth to us, wherein we are admitted to be members of Chriſt, and as members of Chriſt, to be ſons of God, and heirs of his kingdom.

Q. 4. *What? was the Covenant of grace made with man fallen?*

A. 1. The covenant of grace made with *Adam* fallen, and again revived with *Abram* &c. in the old Teſtament, and more clearly revived in the New, is a mutual ſtipulation between God and man ſinful, in and through Chriſts death, on Gods part granting remiſſion of ſins, ſonſhip, and eternal life; and on mans part binding him to faith and repentance.

2. This covenant of grace is one and the ſame for ſubſtance, ever ſince the Fall, and the firſt promulgation of it, *Gen.* 3. 15. yet before Chriſts coming in the fleſh, it was more obſcurely taught; yet as the time drew on toward his coming, the Goſpel light did ſhine more bright; and after his coming and death, it is taught moſt clearly: the ſaints in the old Teſtament were ſaved by faith in Chriſt, *Abraham* ſaw Chriſts day, and rejoyced, and was juſtified by faith, *Rom.* 4.

3. This covenant of grace doth propoſe to us remiſſion of ſins, ſo that we believe and repent, *Mark* 1. 15. & 16. 15, 16. *John* 3. 16, 17, 18. &c. ſo it did too in the old Teſtament, and *Abraham* received circumciſion as a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith; no man may offer any remiſſion of ſins to any but on theſe conditions, on theſe terms God grants ſalvation by Chriſt, *John* 3. 16. and no promiſe in the Scripture can afford any ſtay or reſt to any one that doth yet remain in the ſtate of impenitence and unbelief, unleſs he believe.

4. *Adam* innocent was furniſhed with habitual holineſs; and being vigilant, God would have granted actual ayd that man loſt, and that is not recoverable; and now the Law commands, and gives not ability to obey. The adminiſtration of the Goſpel hath the aſſiſtance of grace to accompany it; yet we cannot offer preventing grace to any: We call people to believe, and to repent, and on conditions promiſe pardon, to that our commiſſion leads us; we preach God gives preventing grace to whom he will, yet to men believing, and praying in faith, grace is promiſed; *Luke* 11. 13. and the ſincere Chriſtian may reſt, reſt on Gods promiſe, 1 *Cor.* 10. 13. *John* 10. 27, 28.

5. Yet though God for Chriſt impart grace to the Elect, yet we believe that God is the principal cauſe of our faith, though man is the next cauſe of it. *Adam* obeyed by the power of that grace given him, and ſo the holy Angels. Chriſt alſo obeyed God by vertue of that fulnes of grace given him, and yet his obedience was meritorious. The Arminians cry out that

the efficacy of grace takes away mans obedience; we deny it, and they cannot prove it. God requires of us faith, we by his grace believe, and so by faith receive Christ, and are ingraffed into him, and saved.

Q. *Of the Covenant made with the people of Israel; and of that promised* Jerem. 31. *and mentioned* Hebr. 8. *How these Covenants did differ and agree.*

A. 1. God was the Authour of both; and that is so manifest, that it needs no proof.

2. God in both those did grant remission of sins, as is manifest in the promises of the Old Testament, in the Sacraments, and Sacrifices *they drank of the Rock that followed them*; 1 Cor. 10. 2. because the Covenant of grace was granted to *Adam*, to *Abraham*, and to the rest before *Moses* time. 3 Because since the Fall, no salvation could be had by that Covenant of Works. 4 Because the Jews in the old Testament, and the Christians are all one Church of which Christ is the Head.

3. Jesus Christ in that and in this is the Author of salvation to the people of God, for he is a Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; *Abraham* saw his day and rejoyced; and the Types did lead to him.

4. In both the old Testament and the New, God requires Faith and Repentance, and on Faith and Repentance, promiseth remission of sins; So *Abraham* believed, and Circumcision sealed up to him the righteousnesse of Faith: and so in the new Testament, *Mark* 1. 15. *Repent, and believe the Gospel*, & *John* 3. 16. & *Mark* 16. 15, 16.

5. In both salvation was to be had; so *Heb.* 11. 15, 16, 17. *Psal.* 16. 11. *Psal.* 15. and in the new Testament, *John* 3. 16. *Rom.* 6. 23. & 2 *Cor.* 5.

2. Yet they differ,

1. In that the Messias was promised, in this he is exhibited.

2. In that the promises of salvation were more obscure, in this more manifest.

3. In that the service was burdensome and hard, in this more ease,

4. In that more of terror, in this more freedom, and the spirit of adoption.

5. In that temporal good things more directly promised, and spiritual blessings more darkly, and shaddowed under the temporal promises; in this the spiritual blessings are more plainly promised, and the cross more spoken of.

6. In that the Church had frequent offerings, and once in a yeer atonement to be made; but in this, Christ once offered, finished the work, and no more oblations to be offered now.

7. In that the spirit of God was given more sparingly, in this more plentifully; then the Law written in Tables of stone, now in the heart: The spirit is now given more plentifully sith Christ is glorified.

Q. *But is not that Covenant* Ier. 31. *&* Heb. 8. *the Covenant of God, promising remission of sins without conditions on our part?*

A. Nō; and my reasons are these. 1. Because Gods Covenant of grace was made with *Adam*, and the others in the old Testament, and that required such things on their part. 2. Because God in the new Testament doth expressly call us to believe and repent, and promiseth no pardon to any one without

out faith and repentance. 3. Because God declareth that we are justified by faith in Christs blood. 4. Because one place of Scripture must be so understood as to agree with the rest; but the word in sundry places doth mention many conditional promises, requiring of us faith and repentance, that so we may be saved.

Q. *What then is the meaning of those mentioned Scriptures* Jer. 31. and Heb. 8?

A. In those words is not set down the full tenor of the Covenant of grace, but some special thing that God doth in the new Testament which was done in the old Testament and this will appear, 1. By what is already set down. 2. By these following.

1. Because God opposeth that Covenant in the old Testament to the Covenant promised *Jer.* 31. 33.

2. Because *Heb.* 10. the Apostle mentions this Covenant, and notes that the special promise of remission of sins denotes the full atonement made by Christs oblation and this was accomplished in the new Testament *Heb.* 10. 14. and *v.* 16, 17, 18, 19. where remission of sins is, is no more oblation: so then the promise of remission of sins *Jer.* 31. and *Heb.* 8. is not a promise of pardon to us without faith, but a promise of full remission to be obtain'd by Christs oblation; yet so, that we according as the other Scriptures do declare, must obtain this pardon through faith in his blood.

3. Because in the new Testament the spirit is given more plentifully, and so in the old Testament, the Law written in Tables of stone, in the new Testament written in the heart; 2 *Cor* 3. 3. and so the preaching of the Gospel is called the ministration of the Spirit *v.* 8. then it follows that the promise of writing the Law in the heart, notes, that in the new Testament God doth more plentifully give the grace of the holy spirit; and so this promise of remission of sins, and of writing the Law in the heart, doth not denote an absolute Covenant of grace yeilding salvation, or justification without conditions on our part.

I come now to examine the objections of *M. Eyre.*

S. 2. *Ob. M. Eyre, M. W.* said in conference, That Christ was not justified according to the new Covenant: Thence *M Eyre* disputes, That the new Covenant was made with Christ, So the Synod. And so because they with whom God made the new Covenant, were in that federal action Types of Christ; as with *Abraham* and *Noah*, because of the sweet sacrifice. See *David*, &c.

Exam. 1. The new Covenant of grace was founded on Christs blood, and through Christ it is made with us; the covenant made with the Mediator, was the foundation of the Covenant, nor the Covenant of grace it self.

2. Though *Abraham, Noah, David*, and others, were Types of Christ, as he was King, Priest, or Propher; yet as the Covenant was made with them, they were not Types, because we are not Types of Christ; and the same Covenant is made with us as was made with them. God is also our God, and the God of our seed.

M. Eyre saith that *M. W.* affirms, That the Covenant with *Abraham* was concerning

concerning temporal bleſſings; But I believe that M. *W.* will not ſay ſo; for *Rom.* 4. 11. ſhews, that the righteouſneſs of faith was ſealed to *Abraham*.

M. *W.* affirms, That the tenour of the Covenant of grace is if thou believeſt thou ſhalt be ſaved. And in this I joyn with him, and it is confirmed *John* 3. 16. *Mark* 16. 16.

Ob. M. *Eyre* argues, that we receive ſome benefits of the Covenant before we believe, therefore our believing is not the condition of the Covenant; if it were, we ought to believe before we receive any benefit of the Covenant. That we receive ſome benefit of the Covenant before we believe, is proved, becauſe the ſpirit which works faith, is given to us before we believe.

M. *W.* denyed that the ſpirit that works faith is given to us by vertue of the covenant of grace.

M. *Eyre* argues from *Heb.* 8. 10. there is a promiſe of the ſpirit, and that is the tenour of the Covenant.

Exam. 1. That the preventing grace by which God worketh faith in us, is given to us that we may believe; we cannot deny that that is before faith in order of nature we muſt confeſs; that without that grace we cannot enter into covenant with God, is alſo moſt manifeſt; that grace is a fruit of our Election, and beſtowed on us in and through Chriſt, who is the foundation of our covenant; but it is not given us by vertue of the covenant of grace made with us, but as a fruit of our election, and an effect of Chriſts death, that it ſo may enable us to believe, and ſo to enter into covenant with God in Chriſt.

M. *Eyre* now proceeds to M. *Woodbridges* printed Copie, the objection runs thus.

Ob. We are in covenant before we believe, *Ergo* we are juſtified before we believe.

M. *W.* Though it could be proved that a man were in covenant with God before he believe, yet it will not follow that he is juſtified before he believe; becauſe the bleſſings of the covenant have an order and dependance one on the other, and are enjoyed ſucceſſively one after another.

M. *Eyre* goes on, Though a man be not ſanctified and glorified before faith, yet if he be in covenant with God (*i.*) one of the Elect, to whom the grace of the new covenant appertains, he is certainly juſtified.

Exam. M. *W.* gave an anſwer ſuitable to the doctrine of *Paul*, *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he hath predeſtinated, he hath called; whom he hath called, he hath juſtified*: Vocation goes before juſtification, and God in effectual vocation gives the ſpirit.

2. Yet it is plain to me, that no man is in covenant with God till he believe, 1. Becauſe circumciſion was the ſeal of that covenant, and it did ſeal up the righteouſneſs of faith; and Baptiſm now is the ſeal of the covenant, and it ſeals up remiſſion of ſins to the Believer. 2. Becauſe God who propoſeth the covenant, requires of us faith and repentance, and then promiſeth pardon, and ſon-ſhip, and eternal life.

3. To M. *Eyre*, Election is not Gods covenant of grace, it is the fountain of our ſpiritual good, but not the actual beſtowing it on us. The Arminians ſo look on the ſentence of the Goſpel, as to deny the decree of election. Some others

others fall on the other extream, in seeking to establish the free Election, they go to overthrow the sentence of the Gospel; but this should not be: we are so to maintain the doctrine of Election, as not to overthrow the sentence of the Gospel. By the decree of God, God intends to confer salvation on such men, but he dispenseth this in the covenant of grace, according to the sentence of the Gospel.

4. By the decree of Election the benefit of the new covenant is intended to the Elect, yet vocation and justification are conferred in time.

M. *Eyre* seeks to prove what is before laid down.

1. God from all eternity did will not to punish his Elect ones, and that is justification.

2. Take it for the effect of his will, justification is the first benefit of Christs death. See *Isa.* 34. 25, 34. 9. *Ezek.* 36. 25. So some Protestant Divines say, that justification is before sanctification.

Exam. 1. That justification is not an eternal act of God, I have proved chap. 2.

2. That justification is not actually conferred on Christs death, chap. 4.

3. The places in *Isaiah* prove that God doth pardon sin; they do not prove that he pardons the sins of men in the state of unbelief. And that *Ezek.* 36. proves not that justification is before sanctification begun. I confess these two blessings, sanctification and justification are together in time, yet sanctification is before justification in order of nature, sith faith that doth justifie is part of sanctification. *Paul* puts vocation before justification, *Rom.* 8. 30. and effectual vocation doth begin sanctification.

M. *W.* denies that we are in covenant before we believe.

M. *Eyre* argues the spirit is given us before we believe, *Ergo*, we are in covenant before we believe.

M. *W.* We believe when the spirit is given us, and so are in covenant by faith.

M. *Eyre*, That weakens not the force of the Argument, for, 1. If the spirit be before faith in order of nature, then faith is not the condition of the covenant, sith the condition goes before the thing conditioned; and then it will follow, that 1. The spirit doth not work faith. 2. Or that the spirit is not given by vertue of the covenant of grace. Or 3. That there is some other condition than faith. Or 4. That there be two covenants, one absolute, the other conditional.

Exam. Though preventing grace, or effectual calling be before faith, in order of nature, yet faith is the condition of the covenant of grace; because it is that which God doth require of us, that we may be saved and justified; and because God in that covenant seals up remission of sins. Though God enable us to believe, yet we believe, and so obtain remission of sins.

2. The spirit doth work faith, and preventing grace is obtain'd for us by Christ; yet the spirit of grace is given, not because we are in covenant, but to bring us into covenant by faith. Preventing grace is a fruit of Election, and the promise of that is fulfilled in the Election, but the covenant of grace is on these terms, believe, and repent, and thou shalt be saved. And so we

grant

grant that there be some absolute promises which God doth fulfil in the Elect, yet the promises of the covenant are conditional, promising remission of sins, and salvation, on faith and repentance. Christ our Advocate had fulnesse of grace to enable his humane nature to obey; and yet M. *Eyre* doth confesse that between him and his Father did passe a conditional Covenant; Even so, though God for Christ did give his Elect preventing grace, yet he enters into covenant with them, on condition of faith and repentance. Gods free Election, and a conditional covenant of grace, do well consist together; and the better, because God by preventing grace, enables them to believe, and to repent. Actual aid and support in temptations, and perseverance too are promised to the faithful; but there is no promise on which a man may rest till he believe. Salvation and remission of sins are promised to Believers, to none else; and so M. *W.* saith, that faith is given us by vertue of the covenant made with Christ, (*i.*) God did promise preventing grace to the Elect, God did promise this to Christ, who dyed for them, to obtain for them grace and glory; and to this I find no reply made. What follows in M. *Eyre*, chap. 16. p. 164, 165. I may well omit; though prevening grace be a fruit of election, and obtained for us by Christ, yet we have it not by vertue of that Covenant of grace, but to bring us into that covenant of grace.

Yet chap. 17. M. *Eyre* invades that answer given by M. *Woodbridge*, and I am glad of it, because I would willingly see what can be spoken in that matter.

M. *Eyre* chap. 17. to M. *W.* the answer implies that there are two covenants one made with Christ, and another made with us; but one and the same covenant was made with Christ and with the Elect: for the Scripture mentions but two covenants, one of works, and another of grace, though the covenant of grace hath been variously administred. 2. Christ merited nothing for himself, and so that promise made to him belongs to the Elect.

Exam. 1. We must confesse that God the Father and Christ agreed together about the manner and means of our salvation; the Father gave the Elect to Christ, and he undertook to procure their salvation; and that which he did as *Mediator*, he did for the good of the Church, and in and by him all good things come to us; Yet the covenant of grace made with the Church, is not that covenant that was made with Christ, but it is founded on his mediation, and presupposeth his merit. God did decree to save the Elect, and Christ undertook their salvation; but God enters into covenant with them in time, when they believe and repent; the promises made to Christ belong to them, yet God did not then enter into covenant with them.

2. Though the Scripture mention but two covenants, (*i.*) of works, and grace, yet sith the covenant of grace doth presuppose Christs merit, it must be presupposed that our mediator according to the will of God had undertook our redemption, and hath now accomplished it for us, and we are to enter into that covenant, trusting on his mediation; and in that God doth not covenant with us as *Elect*, but as believers: God reserveth that in his own secret counsel, none can know his election till he believe; and so God intending to give the Elect grace, calleth them in time, and enters into covenant with them when they believe and repent.

M Eyre

Mr. *Eyre* goes on.

3. Faith is given us by vertue of that covenant, whereby justification, sanctification and glory are given us, *Ezek.* 36.25. *Ioh.* 6.45. *Ierem.* 31.34.

Exam. That we denie, and the places alleadged prove it not, not that *Ioh.* 6.45. God hath made some absolute promises of giving preventing grace, which are fulfilled in the elect, but these promises are not the promises of the covenant of grace: promises of grace, to aid, assist, &c. are promises made to the faithfull, and presuppose that they are in covenant with God by faith in Christ.

Ob. But *Ezek.* 36.25. God promiseth to cleanse them, and to give them a new heart, both are joyn'd together, and so *Ierem.* 31 34.

Exam. 1. We grant that God doth sometimes joyne these promises together, that he will pardon, and give grace, yet in other places he declares whom he will pardon, and on what terms he will pardon, and that is those who believe and repent.

2. Though God joyne these promises together, yet hence doth not follow, that God gives faith by virtue of the covenant of grace, but that the gracious God who is the authour of all good to us, gives preventing grace to his elect, to bring them into covenant with him, and that it is from him that they are sanctified and cleansed.

4. *Ob.* Mr. *Eyre.* Faith is given to us by vertue of the covenant made with *Abraham.* God promised to be his God, to be a *Sun* and a *Shield* to him.

Exam. Abraham believed, and then God entred into covenant with him, when we believe we enter into covenant with God, he is the God of true believers.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre.* Faith is given by vertue of the covenant made with the house of *Israel*, which is the companie of the elect, but faith is promised, *Ierem.* 31.34 *Heb.* 8.10. *Ergo.*

Exam 1. That *Ierem.* 31.34. and *Heb.* 8.10. is a declaration of the speciall blessings that God will grant in the new testament more then done in the Old Testament, the remission of sins, *Heb.* 10.14.15.16. is because then by Christs one oblation our redemption is wrought, and the giving of the Spirit notes the large, and liberall distribution of grace in the ministration of the Gospel: but of this before, S. 1.

2. Many of the elect were dead before that promise was made, much more before it was fulfilled at Christs passion, and in the ministration of the Gospel, as it was published by the Apostles, and so these words cannot be a covenant made with all the elect, as Mr. *Eyre* affirmeth.

3. Though God promise to give grace that worketh faith, yet that promise no unbeliever can rest on, and thence surely conclude, that God will give him faith, but the promises of the covenant of grace are such, that every believer may rest assured that God will performe to him what is promised, and so it is a covenant wherein God bindeth himselfe and sealeth up to us what in the covenant is agreed on, so that we performe what he on our part requireth of us. So *Ioh.* 3.16. *Marke* 16.16. so God sealed to *Abraham* the *righteousnes of faith*, *Rom.* 4.11. the promises of grace made to believers we may rest on that God

will performe them in ſuch a meaſure as may be ſufficient to promote our ſalvation. ſo 1. *Cor.* 10. 13. *Luke.* 11. 13. *Jam.* 1.

Mr. *Woodbridge.* If the text be urged rigorouſly, it will prove that God promiſed to ſend Chriſt, and ſo we are in covenant before the death of the mediatour, as well as before our believing, and then his death procures not the bleſſings of the covenant.

Mr. *Eyre.* Mine intent was to prove, that the ſpirit which works faith is given us, by vertue of the covenant made with us. 1. Becauſe this covenant is made with the elect. 2. The promiſes here mentioned ſhew what benefits will accrew to us by the death of Chriſt; it ſuppoſeth Chriſts death, and that accompliſhed, then would be full remiſſion, and no other oblation would be needfull.

Exam. 1. God Though he did decree to ſave the elect, yet he made no covenant with them *quatenus* elect, but *quatenus* believers.

2. In that the covenant preſuppoſeth Chriſts death, hence it followes that he is the foundation of this covenant that is made with us, and ſo one, and the ſame covenant is not made with him, and with us; and thence it will follow, that the firſt grace is promiſed by vertue of the covenant made with Chriſt, and not by vertue of the covenant made with us.

3. In that Chriſt having finiſhed our redemption, God will remember our ſins no more, it will hence follow, if they import, that no more oblation is to be offred to procure our pardon, and not that we have actuall, and compleate remiſſion of ſins by Chriſts death before we believe.

Mr. *Eyre.* 3. What if it containe a promiſe of ſending Chriſt, may not God in the ſame covenant promiſe both Chriſt and faith? the new covenant was made with all the elect. It is an everlaſting covenant before the world was made. 2. *Sam.* 23. yet it hath three periods of time. 1. After *Adams* fall, then publiſhed. 2. At Chriſts death, then procured. 3. When men come to know and to underſtand the covenant, and to plead it at the throne of grace.

Exam. 1. Gods decree of election is eternall, yet the covenant with the elect is in time.

2. It was publiſhed, *Gen.* 3. 15. merited for us by Chriſts death, but then we enter into covenant when we believe, the Scripture in no place calls the decree of election by the name of covenant, nor doth it import ſo much.

3. I am not willing to charge you with Socinianiſme, but if you make juſtification eternall, and ſay with *Aquinas*, that no temporall thing is the cauſe of what is eternall, you will be in danger to be charged with it: yet I believe that you are free from it, and that you conceive that God did intend their ſalvation from eternity, ſo as that it ſhould be merited for them in time by Chriſts death, and that may lead you to acknowledge their juſtification in time, by faith, for that is an effect of Chriſts death.

Mr. *Woodbridge* ſaith that they contradict Mr. *Eyres* purpoſe: this Mr. *Eyre* denies: they go on and I follow. Mr. *Woodbride* ſaith, that in theſe words are three things. 1. The matter, and bleſſings of the covenant on Gods part. *I will be their God, &c.* 2. The bond of the covenant on our part, and that is faith ſignified in theſe words, *I will put my lawes in their minds.* 3. A declaration

claration that God will work this condition, by which men shall have interest in the covenant, and that is promised not as an effect of the covenant, but as a meanes to bring us into the covenant.

Mr. *Eyre* invades this, and specially the second thing mentioned, that of writing the laws in the heart is a promise, not a precept, and so it doth not denote what is required on our part. To the third Mr. *Eyre* adds, that cannot be a promise, and a precept, and he denies that God requireth conditions of us, and yet promiseth to work them in us. And againe; I would ask whether the promise of faith be part of the new covenant, it is no part of the covenant of works, *Ergo*, it belongs to the covenant of grace. 3. Is the promise of faith an effect of Christs death? all the effects of Christs death are effects of the covenant confirm'd by his death. 4. The Scripture no where mentions that faith is promised as a meanes to bring us into covenant, or to invest us with a right thereto; and if it be part of the covenant to promise us faith, it is no meanes to bring us into covenant.

Exam. With your leave, in these words is a declaration of what God will specially do in the times of the Messiah, (*i.e.*) Christs one oblation shall so obtain full remission of sins, that no oblation shall need to be offered, and God will in those days plentifully bestow his grace; God did not so when he spake from Mount *Sinai*, to press these words further is to wrest them: For, 1. So this is distinct from the Covenant made when they came out of *Egypt*. 2. Yet the Covenant of Grace was made with *Adam*, and continued, in the Old Testament. So then this doth not denote an eternal Covenant made with all the Elect, but the Covenant here mentioned, is a special blessing promised in the New Testament; yet here is no promise binding God to any particular person, but only a declaration of what God will do then.

Obj. But some may object, God doth promise to give the Spirit that works faith, so faith cannot be the condition of the Covenant.

Sol. God in these words mentioned, promiseth to powre forth plentifully of his Spirit, and to accompany the ministration of the Gospel with his grace: This we deny not, we acknowledge the efficacy of grace, we do not conceive that we believe by our own strength, God enables us to believe, and yet we believing enter into Covenant with God, and are justified by faith.

Mr. *Eyres* Questions.

1. God doth command us to do that which he inables us to perform, and God doth declare that he will inable the Elect to do what which he requires of them to salvation. The Arminians cannot digest this, yet we fear not their clamour; I wonder that those that oppose them should not understand that the efficacy of Gods grace doth not overthrow our obedience.

2. The promise of preventing grace is not made to any one particular man, God doth declare, that he gives grace, and that he will liberally give it in the times of the Messias, and this God fulfills in the Elect, but on this promise no unregenerate man can confidently build.

3. The promise and donation of grace is an effect of Christs death, and it is given to bring us into the Covenant of Grace, yet it is no effect of the Covenant, the effects of Christs death, and the promises of the Covenant,

are not of equall latitude, Christ merited grace for us to ingraffe us into him by faith, that so we might reap the benefits of the Covenant.

4. The Scriptures shew that by faith we receive Christ, *Ioh.*1.12. that we so are justified *Rom.*3.25. so we are sons. *Ioh.*1.12. and God in Baptisme seals to us the righteousnes of faith, and it declares that God worketh in us the will and the deed.

5. You have not proved that the promise of faith is part of the Covenant, it may then still be reputed the condition on our part which doth enter us into covenant with God.

Mr. *Eyre* invades Mr. *Woodbridges* glose, in that he adds, *When I shall write my laws, &c.*

*Exam.*1. I confes, that the Hebrew nor the Greek Texts have *when*, and our usual reading in our English Translation is most agreeable with the Original Texts.

2. To all those places wherein God promiseth his Spirit, and no condition is expresst or implied, I answer, that those places declare what God worketh in the Elect, and that those which believe, believe by his gracious aid; yet God promising grace to us praying for it, as *Luke* 11.13. *Iames* 1. shews, that then he doth expect we should pray in faith to obtain it.

3. These absolute promises of grace do not prove that the Covenant of Grace is not conditional; for in many places of Scripture God requireth of us faith and repentance, and Christ shews, that though God gave his Son to obtain our salvation, yet we must believe, or we shall not be saved, *Ioh.*3.16. Gods free election doth consist with the manner of salvation proposed in the Gospel, and a conditional Covenant of Grace doth not overthrow Gods free Election; and so I come to the 19. Chap. in Mr. *Eyre*'s Book.

*S.*3. Mr. *Eyre* Chap. 19. disputes against the conditional Covenant.

1. By the new Covenant, I mean that ingagement which God hath laid upon himself to bestow on them, for whom Christ hath died, all good, which is commensurable to their nature, and this is the Covenant made with the second *Adam*, that upon his oblation God would give all the Elect eternall life.

2. This covenant is not conditional to us, it was conditional to Christ; yet to us it is not conditional, if you take a condition properly, either as antecedent or subsequent; every antecedent condition is effective of that which is promised on condition, yet improperly one benefit of the Covenant going before the other, may be called a condition of the other.

Exam. 1. Gods decree of Election, or his agreement, with Christ, concerning our salvation, are not the Covenant of Grace, the Covenant of Grace is that mutual stipulation between God and the sinner believing, and repenting.

2. Though on our part no merit be required, yet conditions are required, *Ioh.* 3. 16. *Mark* 1. 15. *&c.* And without performance of these conditions, no salvation can be had, *Mark* 16. 15. 16. *Ioh.* 3. 36.

3. Yet these conditions are not effective of our salvation, but they are so required

quired of us, and that, by God, that without them we have no pardon, nor no ſalvation by the Goſpel, nor can we truſt on the promiſes unleſs we performe the conditions, becauſe the promiſes of ſalvation are conditional, *Ioh.* 3. 36. *Luke* 13. 3, 5.

4. You ought not to abſtain from theſe words, ſith God teacheth you to uſe them, but you ought ſo to give Chriſt his glory, as to preſs people to faith in his blood, that ſo they may be ſaved by him.

Mr. *Eyre.* Though God give them one bleſſing before another, yet he gives them not one for the ſake of another.

Exam. Though God give all for Chriſt, as the meritorious cauſe, yet he giveth remiſſion of ſins to men, becauſe they believe in Chriſt, *Luke* 7. 50. *Thy faith hath ſaved thee, Through faith in his blood, Rom.* 3. 25. *Eph.* 2 8.

Mr: *Eyre* objects.

Ob. 1. *Ierem.* 31. 33. *Ezek.* 36. 25. *Hoſ.* 2. 18. &c. No mention of any condition.

Sol. Other places mention the conditions, ſo *Ezek.* 33. 11. *Iſay* 1. 16. 17, 18. *Iſay* 55. 5, 6, 7, 8, *Mark* 1. 15. *Ioh.* 3. 16. & c.

Mr. *Eyre.* No conditional Promiſe is called the New Covenant.

2. That which they would make the condition of the Covenant is promiſed to us.

Sol. 1. Though it hath not the name, yet it hath the thing it ſelf, circumciſion was the ſeale of Gods Covenant, *Gen.* 17. And that ſealed up the righteouſneſs of faith, and ſo baptiſme now. 2. The promiſes of the Covenant of Grace are conditional. *Ioh.* 3. 16 *Mark* 16. 16.

2. Though God work faith in us, yet that is the condition of the Covenant, ſith that is required of us, that we may be juſtified and ſaved.

2. *Obj.* Mr. *Eyre.* The Covenants that did typifie this, were abſolute to *Noah, Abraham,* &c.

Sol. 1. It follows not that God did abſolutely promiſe temporall bleſſings, *Ergo* he wil give Salvation without conditions. 2. Yet we ſomtimes find conditions expreſſed in ſuch grants.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre,* So it would not be a covenant of pure grace.

Sol. 1. Let Chriſt anſwer you, *Ioh.* 3. 16. *that whoſoever believeth ſhould not periſh,* and *Paul, Rom.* 3. 24, 25.

2. *Auguſtine* dealt againſt the Pelagians, that ſay, Grace is given according to merits.

3. *Paul* may teach you, that to be juſtified by faith takes away debt and boaſting.

M. *Eyre* objects to himſelf.

Excep. We attribute not meritoriouſneſs to the conditions, as the Papiſts do.

Mr. *Eyre.* 1. The Papiſts and Arminians aſcribe no more meritoriouſneſs to works, than our Opponents.

Exam. You forget your ſelf too much, you may not ſlander the Proteſtant Doctrine to credit your opinion; we attribute no merit at all to faith, we attribute all to the merit of Chriſt, it would be too long to open how we differ from the Papiſts. 2. As

2. As for *Dr. Hammond*, and Mr. *Baxter*, let them bear their burden.

3. We with *Paul* oppose justification by faith, and justification by works, and therefore you might have spared your putting us on the same terms with *Adam* in the covenant of works, He that will be saved, must be saved according to the Gospel, *He that believeth not shall be damned.*

Except. The conditions in the Gospel are Evangelicall conditions.

Mr. *Eyre.* It is all one, sith Gospel duties are made conditions of justification.

Exam. They are conditions of Gods making, *He that believeth shall be saved*, and the Apostle knows how to distinguish between justification by faith, and justification by works; justification by faith in Christs blood is according to the Doctrine of the Gospel.

Except. Evangelicall conditions are more easie.

Mr. *Eyre:* Is it more easie for one dead in sins to believe, and to love God than it was for *Adam* innocent to abstaine from one tree?

Exam. 1. We make no such exception. 2. *Adam* innocent was bound to obey the whole law. 3. It is by grace, and yet by faith in Christs blood, *Rom.* 3. 25. and *Eph.* 2. 8. Gods free grace doth not oppose justification by faith.

Mr. *Eyre.* The conditions of the covenant are promised in the covenant, so a thing would be the cause of it selfe.

Sol. 1. Of this before. 2. Faith is not promised in the covenant. 3. Though God worke faith in in us, yet it is the condition required of us.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre.* So it is supposed that a man is able to believe of himselfe.

Sol. 1. We feared not the Remonstrants. I have asserted against *Corvinus*, that that may be a condition on our part which is wrought in us by grace, we have heard this boldly affirm'd, but never confirm'd. I dare assert that the efficacy of grace, and mans willing obedience may consist together.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre.* So we should be in a wavering condition, and not assured.

Sol. Rom. 5. 1. 1 *Pet.* 1. 8. *Eph.* 1. 12. 13. shew that believers have the true peace, and joy, and that followes on believing.

Ob. Adams sin is conveid to us without conditions.

Sol. Adams sin passeth to all that are from him by naturall generation; so Christs righteousnes to all that are from him by spirituall regenaration, and that are in him by faith.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre.* So infants, and ideots could have no benefite by it.

Sol. Infants, and ideots may have habituall faith.

Ob. Mr. *Eyre.* The elect had right to the blessings of the covenant before their believing.

Sol. This we denie and you cannot prove it.

S. 4. I come to Mr. *Eyres*, 20. chap. Mr. *Woodbridge* retorts from the place mentioned: Mr. *Eyre* seekes to take it off, and I follow them.

1 *Argum.* Mr. *Woodbridge.* God is not the God of any before they believe: *Ergo* not in covenant with them before they believe.

Mr. *Eyre.* If you take these words, Gods being the God of any in its full latitude, (*i.e.*) for having interest in God, and in all the blessings which God hath intended to his people, I say so too. But if you take it for the actuall enjoyment

joyment of one, or more of these blessings, then I denie it: for though we doe not know nor have the comfort of it that God is our God, yet God may be our God though we have not the evidence of it.

Exam. Still you conceive that faith is but an evidence of our justification, this deceives you, *we are saved by faith*, through faith; and it is the bond of the covenant, *Marke* 16.15.16. *He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved*, baptisme seales up the covenant to believers.

Mr. *Woodbridge* proves that God is not the God of any before they believe, because God promiseth to give faith to make us his people, as *Jerem.* 31. 33. &c.

Mr. *Eyre.* These Scriptures prove no such thing: the promises in them are effects of the covenant, the having a new heart doth not make God to be our God, but because he is our God, he gives us that blessing.

Exam. Concerning those Scriptures we have dealt before, and shew'd that they declare what God will doe in the times of the *Messias*, and what he worketh in the elect: and he gives them grace to bring them into covenant with him.

2. Though God be the God of all men, yet he is not our God, (*i.e.*) in covenant with us, till we enter into covenant with him; when God is the Lord thy God, it notes his covenant with his people, and that they are in covenant with him, so *Exod.* 20.

S. 4. Mr. *Eyre* contends, and seeks to prove this poſition, (*i.e.*).

God is the God of his people before they doe believe, and are converted.

1 *Ob.* God chose them from everlasting, and peculiarly loves them, and God became the God of *Israel*, by setting his love on them, *Deut.* 7.6.7. and when God saw them in their blood, he said to them live, and entred into covenant with them, (*i.e.*) to spiritual *Israel*: the Prophet grounds this relation on to God, from his everlasting love, *Jerem.* 31.1.2. so the Apostle, *Rom.* 8. 31. 2 *Tim.* 2. 19.

Sol. 1. Though God chose his elect from everlasting, yet he enters into covenant with them in time: so *Gen.* 17. with *Abraham*, and that when they believe.

2. God of his owne goodnes chose the people of *Israel* to be his people, yet he entred into covenant with them then, when they undertake to be his people.

3. The covenant mentioned *Ezek.* 16. is that covenant that was made with the people of *Israel* in the wilderness.

4. Gods elect are his elect, and his by election before they are, but they are his people by covenant when they believe in him.

Ob. 2. God is the God of his people, and of their seed; *Gen.* 17. *Act.* 2. 39.

Sol. God is the God of his people believing, indeed they are actually in covenant with him, unbelievers that are in the covenant of the visible Church, (*i.e.*) such as profess the Christian faith, yet are not converted, have the externall communion of the covenant, yet indeed they are not Gods sincere people, nor is he a father to them.

2. God promiseth to be a God of the seed of such as are in covenant with him, and so owns them in the externall communion of the covenant, *tanquam*

parentum

parentum appendices, yet he enters into covenant with them as believers, and ſeals to them the righteouſneſs of faith.

3. When the ſeed of believers fall off from God, and renounce the faith, then the force of this promiſe endeth; God notwithſtadding this promiſe, will not be their God when they refuſe to be his people.

Ob. 3 God hath purchaſed ſuch to be his people before they believe, but what God hath bought he hath a right in, and ſo we are his peculiar people, they are Gods owne.

Sol. God hath right to all the creatures becauſe he made them, he hath right to the elect becauſe he bought them, but yet he is not their God, ſo as to be in covenant with them, or to juſtifie them, till they believe.

Ob 4. We receive faith it ſelfe from God becauſe we are his people, *Gal.* 4. 6. *Eſay* 48 17. *Act.* 13. 48.

Sol. 1. God gives men grace to believe, becauſe they are his elect, *Act.* 13. 48. *Rom.* 8. 30. not becauſe they are in covenant with him, 2. That *Gal.* 4. 6. imports that God gives the ſpirit of adoption to believers, *we are ſons by faith*, *Joh.* 1. 12.

Ob. 5. None can believe, and repent, but they to whom God gives grace.

Sol. We grant, that God gives preventing grace, yet though he begin, and bring us into covenant with him, yet we are not in covenant with him till we believe.

Ob. 6. God is a Father and a ſhepheard to the elect before they believe, *Joh.* 10. 15, 16. the elect Gentiles were his ſheep, and *Eſay* 53. 10 his ſeed, &c.

Sol. 1. The elect Gentiles are called his ſheepe, becauſe they were ſo by deſtination, not that they were ſo actually by covenant.

2. The elect are Chriſts ſeed, becauſe they deſcend ſpiritually from him, but then are they his ſons actually, when they are borne of God, and then are they ſons of God when they receive Chriſt by faith, *Joh* 1. 11, 12.

Laſtly, as for the names of ſome learned men alledged by either of them, I ſhall forbeare to ſtay on them, it is will enough knowne that the Proteſtants have ſo taught the covenant of grace as to require faith, and repentance as neceſſary to ſalvation, and that they have maintained juſtification by faith.

Mr. *Woodbridge*, 1. *Pet.* 2. 10. *You were not a people, but are now the people of God.*

Mr. *Eyre*. That is not according to the externall adminiſtration of the covenant, yet they were Gods people according to the reall participation, or intereſt in the bleſſings of it.

Exam. Though ſome may be in the externall communion of the covenant that have no intereſt in the benefits of it, yet whoſoever are in covenant with God are within the adminiſtration of the covenant, election is not the covenant, God is indeed in covenant with believers, and only with them. And that I prove; 1. Election is never ſo called in Scripture. 2. Gods covenant is ſet forth as done in time. 3. The covenant preſuppoſeth Chriſts death. 4. It is ſo entred into one mans part, that he may have the righteouſneſs of faith beſtow'd on him, and ſealed up to him. 5. Becauſe the Goſpel doth not afford pardoning mercy but to believers. 6. Becauſe our ſonſhip follows on our faith, *Joh*, 1. 11, 12.

S. 5.

§. 5. Mr. *Woodbridge* ſeekes to prove, that we are not in covenant before faith.

1. *Iſay.* 55.3. *Come unto me*, (i.e.) *Joh.* 6.35. *believe in me, and I will make an everlaſting covenant with you*; *Ergo*, none have intereſt in the covenant before believing.

Mr. *Eyre.* 1. The particle *Vau* is illative, (*i.e.*) for ſo that the covenant is the ground of our coming.

2. If you take it copulatively, it is all one as if he had ſaid, I will give you all the other benefits of the covenant; the promiſes that are conditionall in the Prophets are rendred abſolutely by the Apoſtle, as that *Iſay* 59 20. *Rom.* 11.26.

Exam. 1. The particle *Vau* is moſt fitly rendred, and ſo it moſt properly ſignifies: and ſo it is to be taken in this place, becauſe God makes no covenant with thoſe that come not to him: unbelievers have no intereſt in the *ſure mercies of David.*

2. That particle denotes a condition on which God enters into covenant, and that condition is expreſſed plainely in the New Teſtament, *Joh.* 3.16. &c.

3. Though that *Iſay* 59.20. be otherwiſe repeated *Rom.* 11.26. yet it infringeth not the preſent argument, the condition of the covenant is expreſſed in the Old Teſtament and in the New Teſtament.

Mr. *Woodbridge.* 2. The tenour of the Goſpel is, *believe and thou ſhalt be ſaved*; the law, *doe this and live.*

Mr. *Eyre.* 1. The Goſpel is that *Jeſus Chriſt came into the World to ſave ſinners*: the command of believing with the promiſe of life are parts of our miniſtry.

2. They that are called receive the inheritance: thence it follows not, that their calling to faith was the condition whereby they obtain'd the inheritance.

Exam. 1. The Goſpel may be ſaid to be the glad tidings of ſalvation through Chriſt, but how ſhall ſinners have this ſalvation? by faith, *Joh.* 3.16. and 36. *Marke* 16.15.16. &c. this is the ſentence of the Goſpel of which we are the Miniſters, to call men to believe, that they may be ſaved.

2. The Goſpel ſhewes, that not only believers are ſaved, but that they are ſaved through faith, or by faith, *Eph.* 2.8. *Luke* 7.50. &c.

Mr. *Woodbridge.* 3. The covenant of grace is to be preached to every man, and every one is called on to fulfill the condition, to receive the bleſſings by faith, *Heb.* 4.1.2.10.

Mr. *Eyre.* The argument is faultie, the aſſumption ſhould be, but the abſolute promiſe (*i.e.*) of mercy, and forgivneſs without works, and conditions on our part is not to be preached to all men: and that is falſe.

Exam. Let the aſſumption be ſo, and it is true, ſo as we propoſe it, and it is thus. The abſolute promiſe of forgiveneſs of ſins without conditions of faith, and repentance, on our part to be perform'd, is not to be preached; 1. Becauſe Chriſt hath preached otherwiſe, *Marke* 1.15. *Joh.* 3.16. 2. We are taught to preach other doctrine, *Marke* 16.15.16. *Luke* 24.45. 3. Becauſe if that were true doctrine, men might have remiſſion of ſins without faith. 4. Becauſe this doth nouriſh preſumption in prophane men. 5. Becauſe it overthroweth the Goſpel, and the right preaching of it, which is, *Joh.* 3.16. *Marke* 16.15.16.

Mr *Eyre.* Faith is not the condition of the covenant, that *Heb.* 4. exhorts men to ſinceritie, and perſeverance, though men ſhall not be ſaved without faith, that is not the condition, the abſoluteneſs of the covenant is no impediment to faith.

Exam. 1. Faith is the condition, *Joh.* 3. 16. *Marke* 16. 16. &c. and *Heb.* 4. becauſe without faith we cannot have the benefits of the covenant.

2. If forgiveneſs of ſins be promiſed abſolutely, how can you call on men to believe to obtaine remiſſion of ſins?

Mr. *Woodbridge.* Is an abſolute promiſe of grace made to every one that God will give him grace?

Mr. *Eyre.* Though there be not, yet the generall promiſes are a ſufficient ground for our faith, for as much as the grace therein is promiſed indefinitely to ſinners, which all that are ordained to life ſhall lay hold on.

Exam. The promiſes of grace do ſhew us that God is able to give grace to whom he will, and that may raiſe our deſires in the beginning of our converſion, but the promiſes of pardon and ſalvation are made to us, not as ſinners, but as ſinners believing, and repenting; and ſo we come to reſt on them by faith, and after we believe, we have ſure promiſes of grace, and of ſalvation.

Mr. *Woodbridge.* 4. So none but wicked men ſhould be in covenant with God, becauſe the covenant fulfilled ceaſeth, and it is fulfilled when grace is conferred.

M. *Eyre.* So a man might diſpute himſelfe out of the covenant.

Exam. So it will follow, that God is in covenant with wicked men, and ſo men may be perſwaded to continue wicked, and ſo they may loſe the bleſſings of the covenant: and ſo I have followed them to the end.

Some things are omited which I find ſcattered in ſome places, I will gather them up, and ſo cloſe up this chapter.

S. 5. Mr. *Eyre*, *P.* 3. hath ſome paſſage of a Sermon preach'd at *Salisburie*, wherein he endeavours to prove, that faith is not the condition of the new covenant, nor of juſtification, thus, becauſe men are not believers before they are juſtified, *Rom.* 4. 5.

Ob. Rom. 5. 8. and 10. God is ſaid to juſtifie the ungodly.

Sol. 1. Men are believers before they are juſtified, faith precedes juſtification in order of nature, and that is manifeſt, *Rom.* 3. 25. *Rom.* 4. 3. &c.

2 The places alleaged prove not his aſſertion, for 1. it is not ſaid that God doth juſtifie the ungodly remaining ſo. It muſt be then underſtood of the ungodly *antecedenter*, not *conſequenter*, (*i.e.*) he was ungodly, but remaines not ſo after juſtification, as 1. *Cor.* 6. 10. 11. *Such were ſome of you.* 2. Becauſe it is the ſcope of the Apoſtle in that place to prove juſtification by faith. 3. Becauſe that obſcure place muſt receive light from the plaine places, which abundantly teſtifie that we are juſtified by faith in Chriſts blood. 4. So *Abraham* was juſtified, *Rom.* 4. 3.

3. *Rom.* 5. 8. 10. ſhewes that Chriſt died for us while we were enemies, and paid the price of our redemption then, it doth not prove, that we are juſtified before faith; and thus as far as I know I have met with all Mr. *Eyres* objections that are in his booke.

Yet

Yet in the next place I find ſome ſmall conteſt that paſs'd between Mr. *Eyre*, and Mr. *Warren*. I will ſurvey and examine it, and then end thise chapter.

Mr. *Warren* in a Sermon tooke on him to maintaine that the elect before faith had no right in Chriſt, nor any benefit by his death: and this Mr. *Warren* confirm'd by ſome arguments, which Mr. *Eyre* incountreth with.

1. *Arg.* of Mr. *Warren*: Men were not guiltie of *Adams* ſin, till they had a beeing, ſo the elect have no benefit by Chriſt, till they have a being, becauſe *non entis non ſunt accidentia.*

Mr. *Eyre*. *Adams* ſin came on all men before they had a being, and by vertue of Gods covenant made with him as a common perſon.

Exam: How the argument was propos'd I know not; yet let it be propo'd thus, and there is force in it. *Adams* ſin did not deſcend to any till they were from him by naturall generation; and this I prove, becauſe it did not deſcend on Chriſt who was from *Adam*: So Chriſts righteouſneſs is not imputed to any till they are ſpiritually deſcended from Chriſt: but of this before.

2. *Arg.* of Mr. *Warren*. There is no union betweene Chriſt, and the elect before they believe, and where is no union, is no communion: their union is a perſonall union, and ſo it cannot be till they be.

Mr. *Eyre*. Our union is miſticall and ſpirituall, not perſonall, and the elect were ſo in Chriſt as to be one head, &c.

Exam. I conceive that Mr. *Warren* did not intend a perſonall union properly ſo called, for that is abſurd, but that our perſons were ſo ingraffed into Chriſt by faith, that we are ſo actuall members of his miſticall body: and ſith the union is made up by faith, it is not before we believe, and before this union with Chriſt can be no intereſt in his merits to our actuall juſtification.

Arg. And this Mr. *Conant* ſought to prove, *Rom.* 16. 7. they were in Chriſt before me. Whence followes that we are in time by faith ingraffed into Chriſt, and ſo are not in him *ab æterno*; for then one could not be in Chriſt before another.

Mr. *Eyre*. (*i.e.*) by externall profeſſion, and Church communion: ſo hipocrites may be ſaid to be in Chriſt, *Joh.* 15. 23. it doth not follow, that the union of the elect is ſucceſſive to Chriſt.

Exam. Though after a ſort hipocrites may be ſaid to be in Chriſt according to externall profeſſion, and Church-communion; yet the Scripture mentions another being in Chriſt proper to the faithfull, and the union is ſucceſſive, ſo was *Paul* in Chriſt, *Rom.* 16. 7. *Phil.* 3. 9. ſo all good Chriſtians, *Rom.* 8. 1. ſo 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. and *Joh.* 6. Chriſt dwelleth in us, and we in him: and ſo we are ſpiritually ingraffed into Chriſt; and on this union our communion depends, *Rom.* 8. 1. *Phil.* 3. 9.

3. *Arg.* Mr. *Warren*. God made a covenant with Chriſt, that the elect ſhould have no benefit by his death untill they believe, (*i.e.*) to juſtification.

Mr. *Eyre* objects. *Mat.* 3. 17. 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. God was well pleaſed with them in Chriſt.

Exam. 1. That ground of Mr. *Warren* is cleare, *Heb.* 3. 16. *Rom.* 3. 25. &c.

2. The places alleaged by Mr. *Eyre* have been handled before: I intended

not a volume, but a ſhort examination of Mr. *Eyres* booke, which I have now in a manner ended as concerning this controverſy: theſe laſt things are an examination of Mr. *Eyres* firſt chapter; yet that *Mat.* 3. 17. doth not prove that God is well pleaſed with us before we believe.

S. 6. Yet one thing remaines briefly to be conſidered; and that is in the 9th. Chap. *pag.* 90. that I that I omited formerly, becauſe I would not interrupt the preſent diſpute.

Q. *Whether faith doth juſtifie as a condition required on our part to qualifie us for juſtification:*

Mr. *Eccles.* Shall I ſpeake ingenuouſly? I do not underſtand the termes of thoſe that ſay faith is morally a paſſive condition. I had rather keep to the ancient Proteſtant doctrine which is, faith doth juſtifie inſtrumentally, (*i.e.*) it is the ſpirituall bond receiving Chriſt, *Joh.* 1. 12. and uniting to Chriſt, yet it juſtifies not by its owne merit, worth, or dignity, as a worke, or qualitie in us, but in as much as it receives Chriſt, and ſeeks ſalvation in him. We uſually ſay it is a condition, becauſe it is required in the court of the Goſpel that ſo we may be ſaved. So *Joh.* 3. 16. But it is not a condition as works were in the law, it cannot claime it as debt; but muſt ſeek it in Chriſt, and obtaine ſalvation by rich mercy. More then this we needs not ſay: and this doctrine is far enough from Popery, as I have evidenced in my *Theol. Polem* againſt *Bellar.*

Yet it will not be amiſſe to conſider that ſome things that act are called cauſes phiſicall, (*i.e.*) working as naturall agents by a naturall force. Sanctification is wrought by a ſupernaturall power, and *Pareus contr: Bellar:* likes not the terme, *per modum phiſicæ operationis*, yet we acknowledge an immediate influence on the heart, imprinting in it the principles of a ſpirituall life, to ſhew our owne diſability to convert our ſelves. We ſay that our will is paſſive in the firſt moment of converſion: and I may ſay of the materiall cauſe that it is paſſive in the production of ſuch creatures: the Sacraments are ſaid by ſome to worke, but as *Chamier*, they are morall inſtruments, (*i.e.*) they do not by any naturall, or ſupernaturall force ingenerate grace, but they do excite the mind, and raiſe the will by ſignifying, and ſealing to us the good things promiſed. I ſee not how I can call a condition morally paſſive, the condition in the covenant of workes was meritorious, and that which God required of Chriſt was meritorious; but that which is required of us in the New Teſtament is a condition, but not meritorious of eternall life; but it is that which receives Chriſt, unites to him, and ſo we are juſtified by his merits, and ſo it may ſuffice for preſent.

Only in the cloſe I muſt take notice of one paſſage of Mr. *Woodbridge.*

Mr. *Woodbridge.* If juſtification by faith be taken for juſtification in our conſciences, then it is not taken properly for juſtification before God in all the Scriptures, for juſtification by workes is not juſtification before God, and we read of no juſtification, but by faith, or works.

Mr. *Eyre.* Take it obje&tively, (*i.e.*) for Chriſt, ſo it denotes juſtification before God: take it for our believing, ſo it is juſtification in our conſciences.

Exam. 1. I have proved that it muſt be taken ſubje&tively, and not obje&tively.

2. So

2. So we are juſtified before God by faith, *Rom.* 4. 24. 25. by *faith in his blood*, *Rom.* 4. 3. *Abraham believed, and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs.*

CHAP. VIII.

Faith, and repentance are conditions required in the Goſpel, yet they are not our Evangelicall righteouſneſs, nor are we juſtified by our works.

S. 1. I Come now to deale with Mr. *Baxter*. When I ſaw his Aphoriſms, the doctrine that he delivered in them ſeemed to me to be new, and unſound. I could not well brooke that he made Chriſt but *cauſa ſine qua non*, when the Scripture declares him to be not only the meritorious cauſe of our juſtification, but the author of our ſalvation, and that God doth bleſſe us with all ſpirituall bleſſings in Chriſt Jeſus. Nor do I like that he calls Chriſts righteouſneſs, our legall righteouſneſs, ſith that is the righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified before God in the court of the Goſpel, but on this I ſhall not now inſiſt. With him our faith, and repentance, yea and our obedience flowing from faith is our Evangelicall righteouſneſs, which is a poſition ſtrange; and unſound; faith and repentance are conditions required in the Goſpel, that we may be juſtified, faith as an inſtrumentall cauſe uniting us to Chriſt, repentance as that without which pardon will not paſſe, ſith God will ſo manifeſt his mercy, as not to diſhonour his holineſs: but they are not our righteouſneſs, nor is any title in the word that doth in the leaſt meaſure attribute our juſtification to our owne righteouſneſs. I will therefore with convenient brevitie aſſert, and vindicate theſe two poſitions.

1. *Poſition. Faith and repentance are not our evangelicall righteouſneſs: we are not juſtified by workes.*

2. *Poſition. Faith, and repentance are not our evangelicall righteouſneſs.*

S. 2 Mr. *Baxter* againſt Mr. *Eyre*, pag. 26. layes downe ſome poſitions to explaine his meaning, wherein he makes faith a cauſe *ſine qua non*, or the condition *ſine qua non*: yet a ſubordinate righteouſneſs to Chriſt, being the performance of the conditions required, but he in his Aphoriſmes ſaith, that Chriſts righteouſneſs is the *cauſa ſine qua non*, and ſo faith is ranked yet high enough, and too high. In a word faith unites to Chriſt, by whoſe righteouſneſs we are juſtified, and yet is a condition required in the court of the Goſpel, which is a court of grace, pronouncing pardon to believers, and it is not our evangelicall righteouſneſs.

Arg. 1. The righteouſneſs whereby we are juſtified before God, is allwaies declared to be the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, So. *Rom.* 2. 24. 2. *Cor.* 5. 21 &c.

2. Becauſe there is no one title in the word concerning our owne righteouſneſs, to be juſtified by it before God, that conſiſts in remiſſion of ſins, and in the imputation of the righteouſneſs of another, *Rom* 4.

3. When holy men are called, and reputed righteous for their owne righteouſneſs, it is that they are not thereby juſtified before God, but becauſe they attaine to a good meaſure of vertue, which yet cannot ſtand before Gods tribunall,

tribunall, ſo *Pſal.*130. and 142. ſo *Zachary* and *Elizabeth*, *Luke* 1. were righteous, walking in Gods commandements. God accepted of that in Chriſt, not as that whereby they were to be juſtified, but as that whereby he was glorified. So *Mat.*5.15.16. *Joh.*15, *herein is my father glorified.*

4. Though the covenant of works (had men been obedient) had juſtified man by his owne righteouſneſs, yet the covenant of grace offers man the righteouſneſs of another to be juſtified by, it doth not call for mans owne righteouſneſs, the Goſpel is the court of mercy pardoning ſin, not requiring of us righteouſneſs of our owne: and in this the law and Goſpel differ.

5. It is not agreeable neither with truth, nor with humilitie required of us to call our faith and repentance, our righteouſneſs, to be juſtified by it. No, we muſt abhorre our ſelves, and account all loſſe and dung to win Chriſt, to be in Chriſt, and to ſeeke of God in Chriſt the righteouſneſs of faith, *Phil.* 3.9. and as *Auſtuſtine*, my merit is Gods mercy, and as *Bernard*, *thy righteouſneſs is an everlaſting righteouſneſs, it ſhall cover both thee and mee.*

Mr. *Eyre*, chap.6.p.52. diſputes againſt M. *Baxters* notion of our Evangelicall righteouſneſs.

1. *Arg.* We are not juſtified by our works *Tit.* 3.5. &c.

Except. We are not juſtified by works of the Law, but by works of the Goſpel.

Mr. *Eyre* goes on, and diſputes thus. 1. The word admits no ſuch diſtinction, but excludes all our workes. 2. Becauſe the reward is not of debt. 3. *Abraham* was not ſo juſtified, *Rom.*4.4. Workes of the Goſpel are the ſame for ſubſtance that are commanded in the law. 5. Becauſe the Apoſtle diſputes againſt juſtification by works, which we preſume we can performe.

Mr *Baxter* excepts. It admits that diſtinction, elſe *Paul* and *James* will hardly be reconciled: yea *Paul* diſtinguiſheth in excluding the works of the law.

Exam. 1. We can reconcile *Paul*, and *Iames*, without your new divinitie: the Lutherans reject *Iames* out of the Canon, the Papiſts diſtinguiſh betweene the firſt, and ſecond juſtification, *Iames* ſpeaketh of the ſecond juſtification, our learned Proteſtants have reconciled them thus: Faith juſtifies inſtrumentally, works declaratively, and that is ſounder then your new invention: but of that more in what followeth.

2. *Paul* excludes all works, and attributes all to Chriſt.

Mr. *Baxter. Except. Paul* exeludes not all debt, but that which may claime is as meritorious, not as a meere condition.

Exam. 1. That faith and repentance are conditions required to our juſtification, I have proved: did you ſay no more, the matter were ended: but where are faith and repentance called our righteouſneſs, or works required to juſtification?

2. If you bring in our righteouſneſs, that will too much claime it as debt.

3. If you conſider it, what God gives in mercy, is not debt, but grace, God will performe his promiſe becauſe he is true, not that he owes it.

Mr. *Baxters. Except.* Works are to be taken as *Paul* doth, or as *James*, in neceſſary ſubordination to *Chriſt*: *Abraham* was not juſtified by works, as they

they make the reward of debt, but as workes are ſubordinate in Chriſt.

Exam. 1. *Paul* excludes all works. 2. Works that follow faith come after juſtification. 3. Our works, if brought to juſtifie us before God, are not ſubordinate to Chriſt, but oppoſe him. 4. *Abraham* was juſtified before God by faith; but before men by works; he was juſtified before *Iſaac* was born.

Mr. *Baxter.* 4. The Goſpel is a ſubordinate law informed with a new promiſe.

Exam. 1. What then, yet where is a promiſe that doth promiſe us pardon on our obedience?

2. Yet Mr. *Eyres* Argument ſtands firm, becauſe works required in the Goſpel are the ſame that are required in the Law: but works of the Law cannot juſtifie us before God: *Ergo* not works of the Goſpel.

Mr. *B.* 5. *Except.* The Jewes thought not to be juſtified by perfect unſinning obedience, but they thought that their obedience and ſacrifices might procure their juſtification.

Exam. 1. The Apoſtle ſhewes, that no righteouſneſs will juſtifie if it be not perfect, *Rom.* 3. 20. *Gal.* 3. 10. 2. Yet if the Apoſtle had aim'd at this fancy of the Jewes, yet Mr. *Eyres* argument ſtands in force, *Paul* diſputes againſt juſtificacion by works, which men preſume they can perform: *Ergo* he diſputes againſt your juſtification by works, becauſe you preſume that you can perform ſuch works as may juſtifie.

Mr. *Eyre Arg.* 2. We are juſtified before God by a perfect righteouſneſſe, therefore not by our obedience to Goſpel precepts.

Mr. *B.* excepts. The meritorious cauſe of our righteouſneſſe muſt be perfect, but our righteouſneſſe is a meer condition, and ſubordinate to the other.

Exam. 1. The Word mentions no righteouſneſſe of our own to juſtifie us, and ſo this diſtinction is vain. 2. Though faith and repentance be conditions in juſtification, yet good works are not required to juſtification in any ſenſe whatſoever, but wholly excluded. Works of the Law, *Rom.* 3. 28. and works of the Goſpel, becauſe they come too late.

Mr. *Eyre* 3. *Arg.* Our righteouſneſſe by which we are juſtified, is the righteouſneſſe of God, but our obedience to Evangelicall precepts is not the righteouſneſſe of God: *Ergo*.

Mr. *B.* excepts. The righteouſneſſe mentioned *Mat.* 25. was perſonall, and *Iames* 2. and 1. *Iohn* 3. *He that doth righteouſneſſe is righteous.*

Exam. 1. But that righteouſneſſe cannot ſtand before Gods tribunall, to juſtifie any one, that is Gods righteouſneſſe that will ſtand before his tribunall, but our righteouſneſſe cannot ſtand before his tribunall, becauſe it is imperfect.

2 *Mat.* 25. is not deſcribed the manner how God doth juſtifie a ſinner, in and through Chriſt, but how he doth crown the faithfull after their labor ended. Nor doth *Iohn* ſhew how a man is juſt, ſo as to be juſtified before God, but how a man approves himſelf to be obedient after that he is juſtified, and ſo *Iames* ſpeaks not of juſtification before God.

Mr. *Eyre*

Mr. *Eyre*. 4. *Arg* We are not justified by two righteousnesses existing in two distinct subjects, therefore not by our obedience to Gospel precepts: and we are justified by Christs righteousnes alone, and we cannot rely on our owne righteousnes.

Mr. *Baxter*. 1. Not by two righteousnesses coordinate, our righteoulnes is subordinate to Christ. 2. Christs righteousnes is imputed to us. 3. Our righteousnes is required as a condition, not as an addition to Christs perfect righteousnes. 4. We are not to rely on our owne righteousnes, our righteousnes is to rely on Christ.

Exam. 1. Gods word mentions but one righteousnes to be justified by, there is no righteousnes of our owne to justifie us either coordinate or subordinate.

2. The Papists presume not to make their works coordinate with Christ.

3. Faith and repentance are required as conditions on our part, yet not as our righteousnes.

4. Works are not conditions to justification.

Mr. *Eyre*. It overthroweth the difference betweene the law, and the Gospel.

Mr. *Baxter* If you speake of a subordinate righteousnes, I denie it.

Exam. Call faith and repentance conditions, and not our evangelicall righteousnes, I joyne with you; but if you call them our evangelicall righteousnes, and add to them our Gospel obedience, you will not evade; for in this they differ, in that the law requires a righteousnes of our owne by our works, to justifie, the Gospel affords us the righteousnes of Christ, and excludeth our righteousnes in justification.

S. 3. I will now turne to my notes collected out of Mr. *Baxters* Aphorismes, for I have not the book now by me; and against that opinion I argue.

1. The Scriptures attribute our justification to faith, to exclude our righteousnes.

2. All our works are excluded, *Rom*. 3.28. *Rom*. 4. 3.4.

3. Because our good works follow justification, according to the Scripture and the rule of *Augustine*, and so come too late to justifie us.

4. We are justified wholly by Christs righteousnes.

Yet some seeke to assert the contrary.

Ob. Love is part of faith, and faith is to take Christ for Lord, and to submit to him as King.

Sol. 1. 1 *Cor*. 13.13. *Faith, hope, and love, these three*; these three Theologicall graces.

2. The Schoolmen were deceived in calling love the forme of faith.

3. The proper act of faith as it justifies is to rest on Christs blood, *Rom*. 3. 25.

4. Faith is to rest on Christ as King, and to stirre up love, and humilitie to submit to him, and to set feare on worke to reverence him.

Ob. *Abel*, &c, are called righteous, because evangelically righteous in justification.

Sol.

Sol. Our good works cannot justifie us before God, but good men that profited to some good measure of vertue are called righteous, not that they were so justified before God.

Ob. James 2.24. *A man is justified by works.*

Sol. Iames apposeth not *Paul*. *Paul* excludeth all works in justification, yet he teacheth that a justifying faith worketh by love, *Gal.*5.6. *Iames* affirmeth that it is not enough for a man to say, that he believes, or to have a dead faith, such a faith will not justifie: thus far both agree.

2. *Paul* treats accurately concerning the causes of justification, *Rom.*3.24. 25.26.27.28.&c. *Iames* treats not concerning the causes of justification, but to shew that a justifying faith is a living working faith, and to prove this, he shews that a dead faith may be devills, but that *Abraham*, and *Rahab* had a lively working faith, and it had been consonant to the scope of *Iames* to say, that a justifying faith is a living working faith: yet to speak more pressingly, he puts works with faith for a working faith, by a *Metonimie*, and this answer hath been given by our learned Protestants: and that this is the true way to reconcile *Paul* and *Iames* I prove. 1. From the scope of *Iames*, chap.2. vers. 14. &c. it is his scope to prove that a dead faith will not save. 2. From the constant doctrine of the Scripture, excluding our works in justification, 3. Because *Abraham* was justified long before *Isaac* was borne. 4. Because *Paul*, *Rom.*4. proves his doctrine concerning justification by faith without works from the example of *Abraham*.

Ob. Remission of sins is attributted to love, repentance, *&c.*

1. Love is never said to be the cause of remission of sins, *Luke.*7. it is a testimonie of remission of sins preceding, not a cause of pardon.

2. Remission of sins is promised to the penitent, yet repentance is required as a condition, not as a cause.

S. 4. I come now to examine their evasions. We argue.

Arg. Paul excludeth works in justification.

Except. Paul excludeth works of the law done before faith, without grace, not works of faith proceeding from grace.

Exam. 1. So *Bellar. Abraham* was not justified by works preceding faith, but following faith: see how well you agree. 2. If faith that precede works do justifie, works that follow faith do not justifie, but *Abrahams* faith preceding works did justifie, *Rom.*4.3. *Abraham* believed. 2. The Apostle doth exclude all *Abrahams* works from justification, and affirmes that not his works did justifie him, but his faith. 3. Works following faith come too late to justifie.

2. *Except.* Faith doth begin justification, works do perfect it.

Exam. 1. So the Trent Councill too seeks to shift, but in vaine: see how you agree with them. 2. But this evasion will not serve: for faith doth begin, and finish our justification, *Rom.* 3.25.28. *Rom.*4.3.4. &c. *Rom.*5.1. *being justified by faith we have peace with God.* 2 Christs blood alone doth wash away our sin, we partake in that by faith alone, *Rom.*3.25. &c. 3. We must still appeale to Gods mercy-seat, faith goes so to God in Christ.

Except. I do not so require good works as the Papists do, they require it, as merit, or satisfaction, I as a condition required in the Gospel.

Exam. 1. You have the ſame evaſions to elude the places of Scripture. 2. They do not make our righteouſneſs coordinate with Chriſts righteouſneſs, but ſubordinate: they are not ſo ſottiſh as to think their owne works ſatisfactory to Gods juſtice, or in themſelves meritorious of eternall life, they look for remiſſion of the fault from Chriſt, and ſay that Chriſt did merit that we might merit. 3. It is falſe that you ſay, our good works are a condition required in the Goſpel to our juſtification: they are not required of us that we may be juſtified, but that being juſtified we may glorifie our heavenly Father. To whom with the Son, and holy Spirit be all glory. *Amen.*

FINIS.

THE
Lord Craven's
CASE,
BRIEFLY
STATED.

Novemb: 2 LONDON,
Printed by Tho. Newcomb, 1654.

THE

Lord Clive's

CASH

ACCOUNTS

STATED.

THE LORD CRAVENS Case briefly Stated.

Faulconers Examination.

Who ſaith,

THat about a fortnight before the concluſion of the Treaty at Breda, the Lord Craven, the Queen of Bohemia and her two daughters came to Breda to the Scots King Charls, and went not thence till the King went to Honſleidike, a Houſe of the Prince of Oranges. That during that time this Informant ſaw the Lord Craven divers times in preſence with the ſaid King, and every day with the ſaid King at the Court there, he being there with the Queen of Bohemia and her two daughters, to take their leave (as they ſaid) of the King of Scots before he went to Scotland. That ſeverall Officers, about thirty in number, made a Petition to the ſaid King, to entertain them to fight for him againſt the Commonwealth of England, by the name of Barbarous and Inhumane Rebels, either in England or Scotland, for the recovering of his juſt Rights, and re-inſtating him in his Throne, and deputed this Informant and Colonell Drury to

preſent the ſaid Petition, who indeed *drew the ſame. That when the Informant & ſome other Officers came to the Court at* Breda, *intending to preſent the ſaid Petition immediately to the Kings hand, but finding the L.* Craven *very near to him, likewiſe the Marqueſs of* Mewcaſtle, *who preſented his brother Sir* Charls Cavendiſh *to kiſs the ſaid Kings hand the evening before the ſaid Kings departure, who this Informant ſaw kiſs the Kings hand accordingly: the Lord* Wilmot, *the Earl of* Cleveland, *the Queen of* Bohemia, *the Lord* Gerrard, &c. *and a great buſtle of buſineſs; This Informant, with Colonell* Drury, *applied themſelves to the Lord* Craven, *intreating him to preſent the Petition to the Queen of* Bohemia, *to preſent it to the K. of* Scots: *the ſaid Lord* Craven *taking the petition, and reading the ſame cheerfully, ſaid to Colonell* Drury *and this Informant,* There is the Queen of Bohemia, deliver it to her, and I will ſpeak for you. *Upon which they applied themſelves to the ſaid Queen, and ſhe preſented the Petition. After which the King of* Scots, *the Lord* Craven, *the Marqueſs of* Newcaſtle, *the Queen of* Bohemia, *with ſome other Lords, went into a withdrawing room, where this Informant and company could not enter: But the Lord* Craven *came forth of the withdrawing chamber, and told this informant and company,* That they ſhould receive an anſwer from the Queen of Bohemia to their petition, and that he had ſpoken to the Queen of Bohemia in their behalf, *who afterward came and told this Informant and company, that ſhe had delivered their Petition, and that the King had taken order for it. The* next morning *at three of the clock the* King departed; *but this Informant and company had their quarters ſatisfied by the Princeſs of* Orange *according to the ſaid Kings order upon their Petition, and thereby to inable them to follow the ſaid King in the proſecution of theſe wars againſt the* Parliament of England, *which was the effect of their aforeſaid petition.*

That

That this Informant saw the Lord Craven *very often and familiar with the said King, and enter with the said King into the withdrawing chamber, and staid there the last night the said King was at* Breda, *very late.* Richard Falconer.

Colonel Hugh Reyleys Examination,

Who saith,

THat during the late Treaty at Breda, *this Informant did oftentimes see the Lord* Craven *with the now King of* Scots *in his Bedchamber, and also walked abroad with him, there being no man more conversant with the King then he. That the said Lord* Craven *during the said Treaty, did twice go to* Roterdam *and* Dunbagh, *and back again, being imployed, as was commonly reported at Court there, by the said King. That the said Lord* Craven *had a charge from the King to look to one Mrs* Barlow, *who (as is reported, and he believes to be true) had a child by the King of* Scots, *born at* Roterdam, *which he did. And after the King was gone for* Scotland, *the said Lord* Craven *took the child from her, for which she went to law with him, and recovered the child back again,* as is reported. Hugh Reyley,

Capt Kitchingmans Examination.

Who saith,

THat the said Captain Thomas Kitchingman *in* April *and* May 1650. *saw the Lord* Craven *several all times with the King of* Scots *at* Breda, *and waiting upon the said King several times at his Table at* Breda. *This Informant also saw the Earl of* Oxford *at the same time with the King of* Scots *at* Breda, *waiting upon the said King at his Table, and saw the L.* Craven *and the Earl of* Oxford *many times go into the withdrawing rooms after the said King. This Informant also saw the Lo.* Craven *and the E. of* Oxford *in the Bowling-alley in* Breda *Castle with the said King.*

Tho. Kitchingman.

That the 6. of *March* 1650. the ſaid three Informations were read in Parlament, and thereupon the ſame day the Lord *Cravens* eſtate was voted to be confiſcated, without hearing of him; the Lord *Craven* being then beyond the Seas by leave of Parlament, where he had reſided attending his Charge there ever ſince 1641.

Neither was there at the paſſing of the Votes of Confiſcation any Charge or Impeachment depending againſt the Lord *Craven* either in Parlament or elſwhere to which he might anſwer if called.

Die Jovis 6 Martii 1650.

Reſolved by the Parliament, that the Lord Craven *is an offender againſt the Commonwealth of* England *within the Declaration of the* 24 Aug. 1649, *Entituled, A Declaration of the Commons aſſembled in Parliament, declaring all Perſons who have ſerved the Parliament of* England *in* Ireland, *and have betrayed their truſt, or have or ſhall adhere to, or aid and aſſiſt* Charles Stuart, *Son to the late King, to be Traytors and Rebels.*

Reſolved by the Parliament that the Eſtate of the Lord Craven *be Confiſcated accordingly.*

That five moneths after the ſaid Votes of Confiſcation, a Summons iſſued for the Lord *Cravens* coming over, which was publiſhed by Proclamation at Weſtminſter-Hall and the Old Exchange, but no Summons ordered to his perſon, (though then reſiding in a State in amity with *England*) and if a failer (after perſonal ſummons) by the Law of *England*, its but a Seiſure *quo uſque*, no Confiſcation or Forfeiture.

That the Lord *Craven* and others on his behalf, long before the Bill did paſs for ſale of his eſtate, did by ſeveral Petitions to the Parlament (remaining in the hands of Mr.

Scobel

Scobel Clerk of the Parlament, ready to be produced) humbly pray that he might be heard in his own defence the Parlament being informed by the ſaid petitions, that the Information given by *Falconer* againſt the Lord *Craven* was falſe, and that they were ready to prove it, praying the Parlament to put the ſame into a way of examination, but could not obtain it.

Whereupon the ſaid *Falconer* was indicted (ſitting the Parlament) for Perjury in that Information of his againſt the Lord *Craven*, and the Parlament made acquainted therewith, and that the Grand-Jury had found the Indictment; praying the Parlament (again) by petition, that this buſineſs might be examined by the Parlament, but it could not be obtained. Whereupon the ſaid *Falconer* being ſhortly after brought to his Trial at the Upper-Bench Bar, for the perjury aforeſaid, (in the preſence of as great an appearance as hath been ſeen at any Trial in the Courts at Weſtminſter) was after five hours trial found guilty of corrupt, wilful, falſe and malicious perjury in the Information aforeſaid, as by the Verdict upon Record appears.

And though it is not uſual to ſay any thing to confirm the Verdict of a Jury, eſpecially of ſuch a Jury as this was, choſen by the Court, men of repute and eſtate in the County; yet conſidering the Notoriouſneſs of the *Perjury*, and how infamous the perſon is upon whoſe ſingle teſtimony an Eſtate of 1200*l. per annum* hath been confiſcated and ſold. Theſe particulars following are offered for further ſatisfaction.

1. Colonel *Drury*, who (as the ſaid *Falconer* mentioneth in his Information, was deputed with him to deliver the Petition at *Breda*) teſtified upon his oath in Court, that there was no ſuch Petition drawn or preſented by him and *Falconer*, as is mentioned in *Falconers* Informa-

tion

tion to be subscribed by about 20 Officers, and which was delivered by them to the Lord *Craven* to be presented to the King of *Scots*, wherein the Parliament of England was called by the name of *Barbarous and Inhumane Rebels*, or wherein there was the least mention made of the Parliament. And for a confirmation of the truth of his testimony, he produced in Court the very Original petition of *Falconers* own hand-writing: which being then read in Court in the presence of *Falconer*, he offered not in the least manner to except against it, nor indeed could he, when *Falconer* was produced against *Falconer*. The Petition was in these words following,

May it please your Majesty,

THe great sense we have always had of your Majesties present condition, hath been the prime cause of our long silence; but now our necessities are grown so great and insupportable, that we are inforced either to Petition or perish: Most humbly desiring your Majesty to take into your Princely consideration, Their extremities who have been ever ready to prostrate their lives in your Majesties Royall Father's service: Nor no less willing and ready to prosecute the same in what your Majesty shall command: Most humbly petitioning your Royall Order, that some course may be taken for our present subsistance, that our future endevours may not be buried in that unavoidable calamity, which our loyalty hath reduced us unto.

And we shall cordially pray for your Majesty.

There were three other Witnesses produced, who likewise subscribed the Petition at *Breda*, all of them confirming the Testimony of *Drury*; and withall informing the Court that they were then in a starving condition, and that which they petitioned for was meerly to discharge their

their ſcores which they had run into at their Landlords at *Breda*, which the Burgomaſter of the ſaid Town afterwards diſcharged for them.

As to the infamy of the ſaid *Falconer*,

1. It was proved at the Trial by teſtimony of good credit, that the ſaid *Falconer* ſaid, I have ſpent my brothers eſtate and my own, I will never want mony, for whilſt there is any in the Nation I will get it one way or other, and I will do ſomething of *Infamy* to be talked of, that the name of *Falconer* ſhall never dye.

2. It was proved in Court by teſtimony of ſome of the Inhabitants of *Petersfield*, That he drank a health to the *Devil upon his knees*, in the market-place there.

3. It was proved likewiſe in Court, that he frequently ſaid, our Saviour Chriſt was a baſtard, and the Virgin *Mary* a whore.

4. Proved alſo that he gave a man 2*c*s. in gold, and would have had him to conſent to permit him to Bugget him, ſaying, *Dam him, ſink him, He would Bugger his ſoul to hell.*

5. That he was in *Alisbury*-Jaile for ſuſpition of Felony, before he was imployed as a Spy into *Holland*, and his partner committed there with him was hanged, proved in Court by the Jailor of *Alisbury*; And after he came over, he was committed to *Newgate* likewiſe for ſuſpition of Felonny, and divers Charges againſt him proved in Court by Mr. *Powel* one of the Iuſtices of peace, who took his Examination upon his Commitment.

6. It was likewiſe proved in Court, his perſonating of other men, and his counterfeiting of hands to get mony.

7. It was confeſſed by his own Witneſſes at the ſaid Trial, that *Falconer* was purpoſely imployed into *Holland* as a Spy, and proved by other witneſſes that he had a reward; and proved alſo by Mr. *Woolridge* of *Clements-*

Inne, what he ſaid to him of the great reward he did expect for his information againſt the Lord *Craven*.

As for the other two witneſſes, *Kitchingman* and *Riley*, they depoſe nothing as to the ſaid Petition pretended to be delivered at *Breda*: They only informing that the Lord *Craven* was at *Breda*, and frequently in the preſence of the King of *Scots* there, which certainly can be no crime to confiſcate any mans eſtate; The King of *Scots* coming out of *England* to *Breda* in *Holland*, where the Lord *Craven* was by command of his Generals under whom he had a Charge, and where alſo he had reſided by leave from the Parlament ever ſince the beginning of the war in *England*. Beſides, there is not the leaſt proof by theſe witneſſes, that the Lord *Craven ſaid one word*, or *did one deed* againſt the Parlament of the Commonwealth of *England*.

Whereas in the Votes of Confiſcation it is expreſt, That the Lord *Craven* is voted an offendor within the Declaration of the 24. of *Auguſt* 1649. whereupon his eſtate w as confiſcated,

Firſt, it is to be obſerved, that there was no Act nor Ordinance which(as the caſe ſtood with the Lord *Cr.ven*) could bring him within the reach of Confiſcation, and thereupon reſort was had to the ſaid declaratory Vote.

Secondly, That this Declaration was made meerly in reference to *Ireland*, appears by the Letters dated the 15. of *Auguſt* 1649. read that day in the Houſe from Sir *Charls Coot*, when that declaratory Vote and ſeveral other Votes in reference to *Ireland* paſſed: In one of whoſe Letters then read in Parlament, Sir *Charls Coot* had this paſſage, *That the Parlaments intereſt in thoſe parts was in danger to be wholly loſt, and the Forces under his command likely to be ruined and deſtroyed by a numerous party of* Engliſh *and* Scots *under the conduct of the Lord of* Ards, *&c.*

Upon

Upon the reading of which Letters the ſaid Vote did paſs, which in this Caſe is made uſe of as a Declaratory Law to confiſcate the Lord *Cravens* Eſtate, but is only entred in the Journal of Parlament as a *Reſolve upon the queſtion*, without ever being reduced into a Law, or publication made thereof, to the end all the ſubjects of this State might take notice of their concernment therein, as a Law whereupon depended the forfeiture of life and eſtate. The Vote, as entred in the Journal, follows.

Die Veneris, 24 *Auguſt*, 1649.

Mr *Robinſon* Reports from the Council of State a Letter from Sir *Charls Coot*, from *London-Derry*, of the 15 of *Auguſt*, 1649. and another of the 14 inſtant, with Articles of Agreement between Generall *Owen Oneal*, and Colonel *Richard Coot*, in the behalf of Sir *Charls Coot*, Lord Preſident of Conaught, *Dat.* 22 *May*, 1649. which were all this Day read.

REſolved upon the queſtion by the Commons aſſembled in Parliament, That this Houſe doth declare that all perſons, whether Engliſh *or* Scots, *who have bin under the* pay *of the Parliament of* England *in the ſervice of* Ireland, *and have revolted & betrayed their Truſt there, and all other perſons who have or ſhall adhere to, or aſsiſt* Charles Stuart *Son of the late King, or any the forces in* Ireland *againſt the Parliament of* England, *are, and be adjudged to be Traytors and Rebels to the Commonwealth of* England, *and all their Eſtates ſhall be confiſcated, and their perſons proceeded againſt as Traytors and Rebels; and that all ſuch Officers as have ſo betrayed their Truſt, be proceeded againſt by a Court-Martial* there.

And

And that it may the more clearly appear whether this Vote was intended only as to *Ireland*, this enſuing Order made at the ſame time is offered to conſideration, *viz.*

ORdered by the Commons aſſembled in Parlament, that this Declaration be forthwith printed and publiſhed, and that it be referred to the Councel of State to communicate the ſame to the Lord Lieutenant *of* Ireland, *and ſuch others* there *as they ſhall think fit, that the ſame may be put in Execution.*

How far forth then this Declaratory Vote could concern the Lord *Craven*, who never ſerved the Parlament of England in *Ireland*, nor ever betrayed his truſt there, but all theſe troubleſom times reſided by leave of Parlament beyond ſeas where his Charge was, is ſubmitted to Judgment.

It is humbly prayed on the behalf of the Lord Craven, *That his Petition remonſtrating his unparallel'd ſufferings may be read in Parlament, and put into a ſpeedy way of examination; that the honour and juſtice of this Parlament may be thereby manifeſted, the Petitioner relieved, and the People of this Nation rejoyce to ſee a Foundation ſetled upon principles of Juſtice, by which only Nations can proſper and ſubſiſt, and the people be made happy in their Governors.*

FINIS.

The Principles of Faith, presented by Mr. *Tho. Goodwin*, Mr. *Nye*, Mr. *Sydrach Simson*, and other Ministers, to the Committee of Parliament for Religion, by way of explanation to the Proposals for propagating of the Gospel. 1654

First, That the holy Scripture is that rule of knowing God, and living unto him, which who so doth not beleeve, but betakes himself to any other way of discovering truth, and the minde of God instead thereof, cannot be saved.

2 *Thess.* 2. 10, 11, 12. Because they received not the love of the *Truth, that they might be saved*; and for this cause God shall send them strong delusions, that they should beleeve a Lye; *that they all might be damned, who beleeve not the truth*, but had pleasure in unrighteousness, vers. 13. But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, Brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning *chosen you to Salvation*, through sanctification of the Spirit, *and belief of the truth*, vers. 14. whereunto he *called you by our Gospel*, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

15. Therefore Brethren *stand fast, and hold the traditions which yee have been taught, whether by word, or our Epistle.*

1 *Cor.* 15. 1, 2, 3. Moreover, Brethren, I declare unto you *the Gospel*, which I *preached unto you*, which also you have received, and wherein yee stand.

By which *also yee are saved*, if yee keep in memory what I *Preached* unto you, *unless yee have beleeved in vain.*

For I delivered unto you *first of all*, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, *according to the Scriptures.*

2 *Cor.* 1. 13. For *we write none other things* unto you then what you *read*, or *acknowledge*, and I trust you shall acknowledge even to the end, compared with *Acts* 26. 22, &c.

Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, *saying none other things* then those which the *Prophets, and* Moses *did say should come.*

Joh. 5. 39. *Search the Scriptures, for in them you think to have eternall life*; compared with *Psal.* 147. 19. & 20. verses.

He shewed *his Word* unto *Jacob*, his Statutes and judgements unto Israel, hee hath not dealt so with any Nation; and as for his Judgements they have not known them.

And with *John* 4. 22. Ye worship yee know not what, wee know what wee worship; for *Salvation is of the* Jews.

2 *Pet.* 2. 1. But there were false Prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, *who privily shall bring in damnable heresies*, even de-

ying the Lord that bought them, and *bring upon themselves swift destruction*, compared with 2 *Pet.* 3. 1, 2. *This second Epistle* (beloved) I now write unto you, in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance.

That yee may be mindful of the *words* which were spoken before *by the holy Prophets, and of the Commandements of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.*

II. That there is a God, who is the Creator, Governour, and Judge of the World, which is to be received by faith, and every other way of the knowledge of him is insufficient, *Heb.* 11. 3.

Through *faith we understand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God*; so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

Ver. 6. But *without faith* it is *impossible to please God*; for he that cometh to God, *must beleeve that he is*, and that he is a *rewarder* of them that diligently seek him.

Rom. 1. *ver.* 19. Because that which may be known of *God*, is manifested in them, for God hath shewed it to them.

Vers. 20. For the *Invisible* things of him from the *Creation of the World* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his *eternal power and Godhead*; so that they are without excuse.

Vers. 21. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Vers. 22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, compared with—

1 *Cor.* 1. 21. For after that, in *the wisdom of God*, the world *by wisdom knew not God*, it pleased God by the foolishnesse of preaching to *save them that beleeve.*

2 Thes. 1. 8. To render *vengeance* on *them* that knew *not God*, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

III. That this God who is the Creator, is eternally distinct from all the Creatures in his being, and blessednes.

Rom. 1. *v.* 18. For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodlinesse, and unrighteousnes of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousnesse.

Vers. 25. Who *changed the truth of God into a lye*, and worshipped and served the *creature* more then the *Creator*, *who is blessed for ever*, Amen.

1 *Cor.* 8 *v.* 5. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many.)

Vers. 6. But *to us* there is but *one God*, the Father, of *whom* are all things, and we in him, and one *Lord Jesus Christ*, *by whom* are *all things*, and we by him.

IV. That this God is one in three Persons, or subsistences.

1 *Joh.* 5. 5. Who is this that overcometh the world, but he that beleeveth that Jesus is the Son of God.

Vers. 6. This is he that came by Water and Bloud, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and bloud, and it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.

Vers. 7. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.

Vers. 8. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Bloud, and these three agree in one.

CROPPED

Ver. 9. If we receive the *witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater, for this is the witneſs of God, which he hath teſtified of his Son.* Compared with *Joh.* 8. 17. It is alſo written in your Law, that the teſtimony of two men is true.

Verſ. 18. I am one that bear witneſs of my ſelf, and the father that ſent me, beareth witneſs of me.

Verſ. 19. Then ſaid they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jeſus anſwered, Yee *neither know me, nor my Father, if yee had known me, yee ſhould have known my Father alſo.*

Ver. 21. Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, *Yee ſhall dye in your ſins.*

Mat. 28. 19. Go yee therefore, and *teach* all Nations, *baptiſing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; Compared with *Epheſians* 4. 4. There is one body, and one ſpirit, even as yee are called in one hope of your calling.

Ver. 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.*

Ver. 6. *One God and Father of all,* who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

1 *Joh.* 2. 22. Who is a lyer, but he that denieth that Jeſus is the Chriſt? he is Antichriſt that denieth the *Father, and the Son.*

Verſ. 23. *Whoſoever denieth the Son, the ſame hath not the Father*; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father alſo.

2 Epiſt. *Joh.* v. r. 9. Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrin of Chriſt, hath not God, he that abideth in the doctrin of Chriſt, he hath both the Father, and the Son.

Ver. 10. If there come any unto you, and bring not *this doctrin*, receive him not into your houſe, neither bid him *God ſpeed.*

V. That Jeſus Chriſt is the only Mediator between God and man, without the knowledge of whom there is no ſalvation.

1 *Tim.* 2. 4. Who will have all men to be ſaved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.

... *God*, and one *Mediator* between God and men, the man ...

... a ranſome for all, to be teſtified in due time.

... from a childe thou haſt known the *holy Scriptures*, which ... unto ſalvation, through faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus.

... *lyar*, but he that denieth that *Jeſus* is the Chriſt? He is *An*- ... ther, and the Son.

... unto you all, and to all the people of Iſrael, *That by the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth*, whom yee crucified, whom God raiſed from the dead, even by him doth this man ſtand here before you whole.

Verſ. 12. Neither is there *ſalvation in any other*, for there is none *other name* under heaven *given among men, whereby we muſt be ſaved.*

2 *Cor.* 3. 10. According to the grace of God which is given unto mee, as a wiſe Maſter-builder, I have laid *the foundation*, and another buildeth thereupon. But let *every one take heed how he buildeth thereupon.*

ying the Lord that bought them, and *bring upon themselves swift destruction*, compared with 2 *Pet.* 3. 1, 2. *This second Epistle* (beloved) I now write unto you, in both which I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance.

That yee may be mindful of the *words* which were spoken before *by the holy Prophets, and of the Commandements of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour.*

II. That there is a God, who is the Creator, Governour, and Judge of the World, which is to be received by faith, and every other way of the knowledge of him is insufficient, *Heb.* 11. 3.

Through *faith we understand that the Worlds were framed by the Word of God*; so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.

Ver. 6. But *without faith* it is *impossible to please God*; for he that cometh to God, *must beleeve that he is*, and that he is a *rewarder* of them that diligently seek him.

Rom. 1. *ver.* 19. Because that which may be known of *God*, is manifested in them, for God hath shewed it to them.

Vers. 20. For the *Invisible* things of him from the *Creation of the World* are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his *eternal power and Godhead*; so that they are without excuse.

Vers. 21. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.

Vers. 22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, compared with—

1 *Cor.* 1. 21. For after that, in *the wisdom of God*, the world *by wisdom knew not God*, it pleased God by the foolishnesse of preaching to *save them that beleeve.*

2 Thes. 1. 8. To render *vengeance* on *them* that knew *not God*, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

III. That this God who is the Creator, is eternally distinct from all the Creatures in his being, and blessednes.

Rom. 1. *v.* 18. For the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodlines, and unrighteousnes of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousnes.

Vers. 25. Who *changed the truth of God into a lye*, and worshipped and served the *creature* more then the *Creator, who is blessed for ever*, Amen.

1 *Cor.* 8 *v.* 5. For though there be that are called Gods, whether in heaven, or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many.)

Vers. 6. But *to us* there is but *one God*, the Father, of *whom are all things*, and we in him, and one *Lord Jesus Christ, by whom* are *all things*, and we by him.

IV. That this God is one in three Persons, or subsistences.

1 *Joh.* 5. 5. Who is this that overcometh the world, but he that beleeveth that Jesus is the Son of God.

Vers. 6. This is he that came by Water and Bloud, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and bloud, and it is the Spirit that beareth witnes, because the Spirit is truth.

Vers. 7. For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.

Vers. 8. And there are three that bear witnes in earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Bloud, and their [illegible]

Ver. 9. If we receive the *witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is greater, for this is the witneſs of God, which he hath teſtified of his Son.* Compared with *Joh.* 8. 17. It is alſo written in your Law, that the teſtimony of two men is true.

Verſ. 18. I am one that bear witneſs of my ſelf, and the father that ſent me, beareth witneſs of me.

Verſ. 19. Then ſaid they unto him, Where is thy Father? Jeſus anſwered, Yee *neither know me, nor my Father, if yee had known me, yee ſhould have known my Father alſo.*

Ver. 21. Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, *Yee ſhall dye in your ſins.*

Mat. 28. 19. Go yee therefore, and *teach* all Nations, *baptiſing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*; Compared with *Epheſians* 4. 4. There is one body, and one ſpirit, even as yee are called in one hope of your calling.

Ver. 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm.*

Ver. 6. *One God and Father of all,* who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

1 *Joh.* 2. 22. Who is a lyer, but he that denieth that Ieſus is the Chriſt? he is Antichriſt that denieth the *Father, and the Son.*

Verſ. 23. *Whoſoever denieth the Son, the ſame hath not the Father*; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father alſo.

2 Epiſt. *Joh.* v. 9. Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrin of Chriſt, hath not God, he that abideth in the doctrin of Chriſt, he hath both the Father, and the Son.

Ver. 10. If there come any unto you, and bring not *this doctrin,* receive him not into your houſe, neither bid him *God ſpeed.*

V. That Ieſus Chriſt is the only Mediator between God and man, without the knowledge of whom there is no ſalvation.

1 *Tim.* 2. 4. Who will have all men to be ſaved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.

Verſ. 5. For there is *one God,* and one *Mediator* between God and men, the man *Chriſt Ieſus.*

Ver. 6. Who gave himſelf a ranſome for all, to be teſtified in due time.

2 *Tim.* 3. 15. And that from a childe thou haſt known the *holy Scriptures,* which are able to make thee wiſe unto ſalvation, through faith which is in Chriſt Ieſus.

1 *Joh.* 2. 22. Who is a *lyar,* but he that denieth that *Ieſus* is the Chriſt? He is *Antichriſt* that denieth the Father, and the Son.

Acts 4. 10. Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Iſrael, *That by the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth,* whom yee crucified, whom God raiſed from the dead, even by him doth this man ſtand here before you whole.

Verſ. 12. Neither is there *ſalvation in any other,* for there is none *other name* under heaven *given among men, whereby we muſt be ſaved.*

2 *Cor.* 3. 10. According to the grace of God which is given unto mee, as a wiſe Maſter-builder, I have laid *the foundation,* and another buildeth thereupon. But let every one take heed how he buildeth thereupon.

Verſ.11. For *other foundation can no man lay*, then that is laid, which is *Jeſus Chriſt*.

VI. That this Jeſus Chriſt is the true God, 1 *Joh.*5.29. And wee know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an *underſtanding, that we may know him that is true.* And we are in him that is true, even in his *Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God, and eternal life.*

Iſa 45.21. There is *no God* elſe beſides me, a juſt God and *Saviour*, there is none beſide me.

Verſ.22. Look unto *me*, and be *ye ſaved all the ends of the earth*, for *I am God*, and there is none elſe.

23. I have ſworn by my ſelf, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteouſneſſe, and ſhall not return, that unto me every knee ſhall bow, every tongue ſhall ſwear.

24. Surely ſhall one ſay, in *the Lord* have I righteouſneſſe and ſtrength, even to *him ſhall men come*, and all that are incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed.

25. In the *Lord* ſhall all the ſeed of *Iſrael* be *juſtified*, and ſhall glory, which the Apoſtle applies unto Chriſt. *Rom.*14.11,12. and *Philip.*2.6. to the 12.

VII. That this Jeſus Chriſt is alſo true man, 1 *Joh.*4.2. Hereby know yee the Spirit of God; every *ſpirit* that *confeſſeth* that *Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is of God.*

Verſ.3. And every *ſpirit* that confeſſeth not that *Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God. And this is that ſpirit of Antichriſt.*

2 Joh. 7. For *many deceivers are entred into the world*, who *confeſſe not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh. This is a Deceiver and an Antichriſt.*

VIII. That this Jeſus Chriſt is God and Man in one Perſon, 1 *Tim.*3.16. and *without controverſie*, great is the *myſtery of godlineſſe. God was manifeſted in the fleſh*, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, beleeved on in the World, received up into glory.

*Matth.*16.13. Jeſus asked his Diſciples, ſaying, whom do men ſay that *I the Son of man am?*

Verſ.14. They ſaid, ſome ſay thou art *John the Baptiſt*, &c.

Verſ.15. But whom ſay yee that I am?

Verſ.16. *Simon Peter* anſwered, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God.*

Verſ.17. Jeſus ſaid unto him, Bleſſed art thou, *Simon Bar-Jona*, for fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

Verſ.18. And I ſay unto thee, Thou art *Peter*, and *upon this Rock I will build my Church*, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.

IX. That this Jeſus Chriſt is our Redeemer, who by paying a Ranſome, and bearing our ſins, hath made ſatisfaction for them.

*Iſa.*53.11. By *his knowledge* ſhall my righteous ſervant *juſtifie many*, for *he ſhall bear their iniquities*, compared with

1 *Pet.*2.24. Who his own ſelf *bare our ſins in his own body on the tree*, that wee being dead to ſin, ſhould live to righteouſneſſe, by whoſe ſtripes yee were healed.

25. For yee were as ſheep *going aſtray*, but are now returned unto the *Shepherd and Biſhop of your ſouls.*

1 *Cor.* 15 2. By which also you are saved, if you keep in memory what I preached unto you, *unlesse ye have believed in vain.*

Vers. 3. For I delivered unto you *first of all*, that also which I received, how that *Christ dyed for our sins*, according to the Scriptures.

1 *Tim.* 2.4. Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the *knowledge of the truth.*

Vers. 5. For there is one God, and one *Mediator* between God and men, the *man Christ Jesus.*

Vers. 6. Who gave himself *a ransome* for all, to be *testified in due time*, 1 Cor. 6.20. Yee are bought with a price.

X. That this same Lord Jesus Christ is hee that was Crucified at *Jerusalem*, and rose again, and ascended into heaven.

Joh. 8.24. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall dye in your sins; for if ye beleeve *not that I am he*, ye shall *dye in your sins.*

Act. 4, 10. Be that *known unto you all*, and to all the *people of Israel*, that by the *name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth*, *whom ye crucified*, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole.

Vers. 11. *This is the stone* which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.

Vers, 12. *Neither is there salvation in any other*, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.

Act. 10.38. How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil, for God was with him.

Vers. 39. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the *Iews* and in *Ierusalem*, *whom they slew and hanged on a tree.*

Vers. 40. *Him* God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly.

Vers. 41. Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him, after he rose from the dead.

Vers. 42. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testifie that it is he, *who was ordained of God, to be the Iudge of quick and dead.*

Vers. 43. To *him* give all the Prophets witnesse that *through his Name*, *whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*

1 *Cor.* 15.2. By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unlesse ye have beleeved in vain.

Vers. 3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ dyed for our sins, according to the Scriptures.

Vers. 4. And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.

Vers. 5. And that he was seen of *Cephas*, then of the Twelve.

Vers. 6. After that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fain asleep.

Vers 7. After that he was seen of *Iames*, then of all the Apostles.

Vers. 8. And last of all he was seen of me also.

Verſ.11. For *other foundation can no man lay*, then that is laid, which is *Jeſus Chriſt*.

VI. That this Jeſus Chriſt is the true God, 1 *Joh.*5.29. And wee know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an *underſtanding, that we may know him that is true.* And we are in him that is true, even in his *Son Jeſus Chriſt. This is the true God, and eternal life.*

Iſa 45.21. There is *no God* elſe beſides me, a juſt God and *Saviour*, there is none beſide me.

Verſ.22. Look unto *me*, and be *ye ſaved all the ends of the earth*, for *I am God*, and there is none elſe.

23. I have ſworn by my ſelf, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteouſneſſe, and ſhall not return, that unto me every knee ſhall bow, every tongue ſhall ſwear.

24. Surely ſhall one ſay, in *the Lord* have I righteouſneſſe and ſtrength, even to *him ſhall men come*, and all that are incenſed againſt him ſhall be aſhamed.

25. In the *Lord* ſhall all the ſeed of *Iſrael* be *juſtified*, and ſhall glory, which the Apoſtle applies unto Chriſt *Rom.*14.11,12. and *Philip.*2.6. to the 12.

VII. That this Jeſus Chriſt is alſo true man, 1 *Joh.*4.2. Hereby know yee the Spirit of God; every *ſpirit* that *confeſſeth* that *Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is of God.*

Verſ.3. And every *ſpirit* that confeſſeth not that *Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God. And this is that ſpirit of Antichriſt.*

2 Joh. 7. For *many deceivers are entred into the world*, who *confeſſe not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh. This is a Deceiver and an Antichriſt.*

VIII. That this Jeſus Chriſt is God and Man in one Perſon, 1 *Tim.*3.16. and *without controverſie*, great is the *myſtery of godlineſſe. God was manifeſted in the fleſh*, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, beleeved on in the World, received up into glory.

*Matth.*16.13. Jeſus asked his Diſciples, ſaying, whom do men ſay that *I the Son of man am?*

Verſ.14. They ſaid, ſome ſay thou art *John the Baptiſt*, &c.

Verſ.15. But whom ſay yee that I am?

Verſ.16. *Simon Peter* anſwered, *Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God.*

Verſ.17. Jeſus ſaid unto him, Bleſſed art thou, *Simon Bar-Jona*, for fleſh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

Verſ.18. And I ſay unto thee, Thou art *Peter*, and *upon this Rock I will build my Church*, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.

IX. That this Jeſus Chriſt is our Redeemer, who by paying a Ranſome, and bearing our ſins, hath made ſatisfaction for them.

*Iſa.*53.11. By *his knowledge* ſhall my righteous ſervant *juſtifie many*, for *he ſhall bear their iniquities*, compared with

1 *Pet.*2.24. Who his own ſelf *bare our ſins in his own body on the tree*, that wee being dead to ſin, ſhould live to righteouſneſſe, by whoſe ſtripes yee were healed.

25. For yee were as ſheep *going aſtray*, but are now returned unto the *Shepherd and Biſhop of your ſouls.*

1 *Cor.* 15 2. By which alſo you are ſaved, if you keep in memory what I preached unto you, *unleſſe ye have believed in vain.*

Verſ. 3. For I delivered unto you *firſt of all*, that alſo which I received, how that *Chriſt dyed for our ſins*, according to the Scriptures.

1 *Tim.* 2.4. Who will have all men to be ſaved, and to come unto the *knowledge of the truth.*

Verſ. 5. For there is one God, and one *Mediator* between God and men, the *man Chriſt Jeſus.*

Verſ. 6. Who gave himſelf *a ranſome* for all, to be *teſtified in due time*, 1 Cor. 6.20. Yee are bought with a price.

X. That this ſame Lord Jeſus Chriſt is hee that was Crucified at *Jeruſalem*, and roſe again, and aſcended into heaven.

Ioh. 8.24. I ſaid therefore unto you, that ye ſhall dye in your ſins; for if ye beleeve *not that I am he*, ye ſhall *dye in your ſins.*

Act. 4.10. Be that *known unto you all*, and to all the *people of Iſrael*, that by the *name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth, whom ye crucified*, whom God raiſed from the dead, even by him doth this man ſtand here before you whole.

Verſ. 11. *This is the ſtone* which was ſet at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner.

Verſ. 12. *Neither is there ſalvation in any other*, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we muſt be ſaved.

Act. 10.38. How God anointed Jeſus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghoſt, and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppreſſed of the Devil, for God was with him.

Verſ. 39. And we are witneſſes of all things which he did, both in the land of the *Iews* and in *Ieruſalem, whom they ſlew and hanged on a tree.*

Verſ. 40. *Him* God raiſed up the third day, and ſhewed him openly.

Verſ. 41. Not to all the people, but unto witneſſes choſen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him, after he roſe from the dead.

Verſ. 42. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to teſtifie that it is he, *who was ordained of God, to be the Iudge of quick and dead.*

Verſ. 43. To *him* give all the Prophets witneſſe that *through his Name, whoſoever believeth in him ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins.*

1 *Cor.* 15.2. By which alſo ye are ſaved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unleſſe ye have beleeved in vain.

Verſ. 3 For I delivered unto you firſt of all that which I alſo received, how that Chriſt dyed for our ſins, according to the Scriptures.

Verſ. 4. And that he was buried, and that he roſe again the third day, according to the Scriptures.

Verſ. 5. And that he was ſeen of *Cephas*, then of the Twelve.

Verſ. 6. After that he was ſeen of above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this preſent, but ſome are faln aſleep.

Verſ. 7. After that he was ſeen of *Iames*, then of all the Apoſtles.

Verſ. 8. And laſt of all he was ſeen of me alſo.

*Act.*22.8. Who art thou Lord? and he said, I am Jesus of Nazareth.

*Act.*2.36. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Iesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ. Vers. 37. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto *Peter*, and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, What shall wee do? Vers,38. Then *Peter* said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Iesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

XI. That this same Iesus Christ, being the onely God and Man in one Person, remains for ever a distinct Person from all Saints and Angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him.

Col 2.8. Beware lest any man spoyl you, through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

Vers *9*. For in him dwelleth all the fulnesse of the God-head bodily.

Vers.10. And ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all Principality and Power. Vers.19. And not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts and bands, having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

1 *Tim* 3 16. God manifested in the flesh, beleeved on in the world.

XII. That all men by nature are dead in trespasses and sins, and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent, and beleeve, *Joh.*3.3. Iesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God. Vers.5 6 7. Iesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God; That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. Vers.10. Iesus answered, and said unto him, Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?

*Act.*17.30,31. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day wherein hee will judge the world in righteousnesse.

*Act.*26.17,18,19,20. Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, To open their eyes, and to turn them from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſse of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. Whereupon I was not disobedient to the heavenly Vision, but shewed first to them at *Damascus*, and at *Ierusalem*, and throughout all the coasts of *Iudea*, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Luke* 24.47. that repentance and forgiveneſse of sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations.

Act 20 20,21. I have shewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from house to house, testifying both to Iews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Iesus Christ.

Joh. 5,24,25. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and beleeveth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.

XIII.

XIII. That we are juſtified and ſaved by grace, and faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and not by works.

Acts 15. 24. For as much as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, ſubverting your ſouls; ſaying, *Yee muſt be circumciſed, and keep the Law*, compared with *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8. 9. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel which is not another; but there are ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt; but though we, or an Angel from heaven preach another Goſpel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* As wee ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man preach any other Goſpel unto you, then that ye have received, let him be accurſed*, Gal 5.

Ver. 2. 4, 5. Behold, I *Paul* ſay unto you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are faln from grace, for we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteouſneſs by faith. *Rom.* 9. *v.* 31, 32. 33. But *Iſrael*, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe. wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone; As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever beleeveth on him ſhall not be aſhamed, compared with *Rom.* 10. *v.* 3, 4. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God, for Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs for every one that beleeveth

Rom. 1. 16, 17. I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt. for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that beleeveth, to the *Jew* firſt, and alſo to the *Greek*; for therein is the righteouſneſs of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written. *The juſt ſhall live by faith*, compared with *Gal.* 3. 11. But that no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, it is evident; for, *the juſt ſhall live by faith.*

Eph. 2. 8, 9, 10. For by grace ye are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God; not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt; for we are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we ſhould walk in them.

XV. That to continue in any known ſin, upon what pretence or principle ſoever, is damnable.

Rom. 1. 32. Who knowing the Judgement of God, that they which commit ſuch things are worthy of death, not onely to do the ſame, but have pleaſure in them that do them.

Rom. 6. *v.* 1, 2. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall wee continue in ſin that grace may abound? God forbid; How ſhall wee, that are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? compared with verſ 15. and 16. What then? ſhall wee ſin, becauſe wee are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid. Know yee not, that to whom yee yeeld your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants yee are to whom yee obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſſe?

1 *John* 1. 6. 8. If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in dark-

*Act.*22.8. Who art thou Lord? and he ſaid, I am Jeſus of Nazareth.

*Act.*2.36. Therefore let all the houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly, that God hath made that ſame Ieſus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Chriſt. Verſ. 37. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and ſaid unto *Peter*, and to the reſt of the Apoſtles, Men and Brethren, What ſhall wee do? Verſ,38. Then *Peter* ſaid unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Ieſus Chriſt for the remiſſion of ſins, and ye ſhall receive the gift of the Holy Ghoſt.

XI. That this ſame Ieſus Chriſt, being the onely God and Man in one Perſon, remains for ever a diſtinct Perſon from all Saints and Angels, notwithſtanding their union and communion with him.

Col 2.8. Beware leſt any man ſpoyl you, through Philoſophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Chriſt.

Verſ 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulneſſe of the God-head bodily.

Verſ.10. And ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all Principality and Power. Verſ.19. And not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts and bands, having nouriſhment miniſtred, and knit together, increaſeth with the increaſe of God.

1 *Tim* 3 16. God manifeſted in the fleſh, beleeved on in the world.

XII. That all men by nature are dead in treſpaſſes and ſins, and no man can be ſaved unleſſe he be born again, repent, and beleeve, *Joh.*3.3. Ieſus anſwered and ſaid unto him, Verily, verily, I ſay unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot ſee the Kingdome of God. Verſ.5 6 7. Ieſus anſwered, Verily, verily, I ſay unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God; That which is born of the fleſh is fleſh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I ſaid unto thee, Ye muſt be born again. Verſ.10. Ieſus anſwered, and ſaid unto him, Art thou a Maſter in Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe things?

*Act.*17.30,31. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, becauſe he hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteouſneſſe.

*Act.*26.17,18,19,20. Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now ſend thee, To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkneſſe to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſſe of ſins, and inheritance among them that are ſanctified by faith in me. Whereupon I was not diſobedient to the heavenly Viſion, but ſhewed firſt to them at *Damaſcus*, and at *Jeruſalem*, and throughout all the coaſts of *Judea*, and then to the Gentiles, that they ſhould repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Luke* 24.47. that repentance and forgiveneſſe of ſins ſhould be preached in his Name among all Nations.

Act 20 20,21. I have ſhewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from houſe to houſe, teſtifying both to Iews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Ieſus Chriſt.

Joh. 5,24,25. Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, he that heareth my word, and beleeveth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life, and ſhall not come into condemnation, but is paſſed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead ſhall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear ſhall live.

CROPPED

XIII. That we are juſtified and ſaved by grace, and faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and not by works.

Acts 15. 24. For as much as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, ſubverting your ſouls; ſaying, *Yee muſt be circumciſed, and keep the Law*, compared with *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8. 9. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel which is not another; but there are ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt; but though we, or an Angel from heaven preach another Goſpel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* As wee ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man preach any other Goſpel unto you, then that ye have received, let him be accurſed*, Gal 5.

Ver. 2. 4, 5. Behold, I *Paul* ſay unto you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are faln from grace, for we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteouſeſs by faith. *Rom.* 9. *v.* 31, 32. 33. But *Iſrael*, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe. wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone; As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever beleeveth on him ſhall not be aſhamed, compared with *Rom.* 10. *v.* 3, 4. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God, for Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs for every one that beleeveth

Rom. 1. 16, 17. I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt. for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that beleeveth, to the *Jew* firſt, and alſo to the *Greek*; for therein is the righteouſneſs of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written. *The juſt ſhall live by faith*, compared with *Gal.* 3. 11. But that no man is juſtified by the [illegible] evident; for, *the juſt ſhall live by faith.*

[illegible] are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, [illegible] leaſt any man ſhould boaſt; for we are his work- [illegible] unto good works, which God hath before ordained

[illegible] any known ſin, upon what pretence or principle

[illegible] the Judgement of God, that they which commit ſuch things are worthy of death, not onely to do the ſame, but have pleaſure in them that do them.

Rom. 6. *v.* 1, 2. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall wee continue in ſin that grace may abound? God forbid; How ſhall wee, that are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? compared with verſ 15. and 16. What then? ſhall wee ſin, becauſe wee are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid. Know yee not, that to whom yee yeeld your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants yee are to whom yee obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſſe?

1 *John* 1. 6. 8. If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in dark-

PED PAGES

*Act.*22.8. Who art thou Lord? and he said, I am Jesus of Nazareth.

*Act.*2.36. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Iesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ. Vers. 37. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto *Peter*, and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, What shall wee do? Vers,38. Then *Peter* said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Iesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

XI. That this same Iesus Christ, being the onely God and Man in one Person, remains for ever a distinct Person from all Saints and Angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him.

Col 2.8. Beware lest any man spoyl you, through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

Vers 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulnesse of the God-head bodily.

Vers.10. And ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all Principality and Power. Vers.19. And not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts and bands, having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

1 *Tim* 3 16. God manifested in the flesh, beleeved on in the world.

XII. That all men by nature are dead in trespasses and sins, and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent, and beleeve, *Joh.*3.3. Iesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God. Vers.5 6 7. Iesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God; That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. Vers.10. Iesus answered, and said unto him, Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?

*Act.*17.30,31. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day wherein hee will judge the world in righteousnesse.

*Act.*26.17,18,19,20. Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, To open their eyes, and to turn them from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſſe of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. Whereupon I was not disobedient to the heavenly Vision, but shewed first to them at *Damascus*, and at *Jerusalem*, and throughout all the coasts of *Judea*, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Luke* 24.47. that repentance and forgiveneſſe of sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations.

Act 20 20,21. I have shewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from house to house, testifying both to Iews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Iesus Christ.

Joh. 5,24,25. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and beleeveth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.

XIII. That we are juſtified and ſaved by grace, and faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and not by works.

Acts 15. 24. For as much as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, ſubverting your ſouls; ſaying, *Yee muſt be circumciſed, and keep the Law*, compared with *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8. 9. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel which is not another; but there are ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt; but though we, or an Angel from heaven preach another Goſpel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* As wee ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man preach any other Goſpel unto you, then that ye have received, let him be accurſed*, Gal 5.

Ver. 2. 4, 5. Behold, I *Paul* ſay unto you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are faln from grace, for we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteouſneſs by faith. *Rom.* 9. *v.* 31, 32. 33. But *Iſrael*, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe. wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone; As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever beleeveth on him ſhall not be aſhamed, compared with *Rom.* 10. *v.* 3, 4. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God, for Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs for every one that beleeveth

Rom. 1. 16, 17. I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt. for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that beleeveth, to the *Jew* firſt, and alſo to the *Greek*; for therein is the righteouſneſs of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written. *The juſt ſhall live by faith*, compared with *Gal.* 3. 11. But that no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, it is evident; for, *the juſt ſhall live by faith.*

Eph. 2. 8, 9, 10. For by grace ye are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God, not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt; for we are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we ſhould walk in them.

XV. That to continue in any known ſin, upon what pretence or principle ſoever, is damnable.

Rom. 1. 32. Who knowing the Judgement of God, that they which commit ſuch things are worthy of death, not onely to do the ſame, but have pleaſure in them that do them.

Rom. 6. *v.* 1, 2. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall wee continue in ſin that grace may abound? God forbid; How ſhall wee, that are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? compared with verſ 15. and 16. What then? ſhall wee ſin, becauſe wee are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid. Know yee not, that to whom yee yeeld your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants yee are to whom yee obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſſe?

1 *John* 1. 6. 8. If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in dark-

*Act.*22.8. Who art thou Lord? and he said, I am Jesus of Nazareth.

*Act.*2.36. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Iesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ. Vers. 37. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto *Peter*, and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, What shall wee do? Vers,38. Then *Peter* said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Iesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

XI. That this same Iesus Christ, being the onely God and Man in one Person, remains for ever a distinct Person from all Saints and Angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him.

Col 2.8. Beware lest any man spoyl you, through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

Vers 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulnesse of the God-head bodily.

Vers.10. And ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all Principality and Power. Vers.19. And not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts and bands, having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

1 *Tim* 3 16. God manifested in the flesh, beleeved on in the world.

XII. That all men by nature are dead in trespasses and sins, and no man can be saved unless he be born again, repent, and beleeve, *Joh.*3.3. Iesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God. Vers.5 6 7. Iesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God; That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. Vers.10. Iesus answered, and said unto him, Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?

*Act.*17.30,31. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day wherein hee will judge the world in righteousnesse.

*Act.*26.17,18,19,20. Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, To open their eyes, and to turn them from darknesse to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveneſſe of sins, and inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. Whereupon I was not disobedient to the heavenly Vision, but shewed first to them at *Damascus*, and at *Jerusalem*, and throughout all the coasts of *Judea*, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Luke* 24.47. that repentance and forgiveneſſe of sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations.

Act 20 20,21. I have shewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from house to house, testifying both to Iews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Iesus Christ.

Joh. 5.24,25. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and beleeveth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.

XIII

XIII. That we are juſtified and ſaved by grace, and faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and not by works.

Acts 15. 24. For as much as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, ſubverting your ſouls; ſaying, *Yee muſt be circumciſed, and keep the Law*, compared with *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8. 9. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel which is not another; but there are ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt; but though we, or an Angel from heaven preach another Goſpel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* As wee ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man preach any other Goſpel unto you, then that ye have received, let him be accurſed*, Gal 5.

Ver. 2. 4, 5. Behold, I *Paul* ſay unto you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are faln from grace, for we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteouſneſs by faith. *Rom.* 9. *v.* 31, 32. 33. But *Iſrael*, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe. wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone; As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever beleeveth on him ſhall not be aſhamed, compared with *Rom.* 10. *v.* 3, 4. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God, for Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs for every one that beleeveth.

Rom. 1. 16, 17. I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt. for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that beleeveth, to the *Jew* firſt, and alſo to the *Greek*; for therein is the righteouſneſs of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written. *The juſt ſhall live by faith*, compared with *Gal.* 3. 11. But that no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, it is evident; for, *the juſt ſhall live by faith.*

Eph. 2. 8, 9, 10. For by grace ye are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, it is the gift of God, not of works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt; for we are his workmanſhip created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we ſhould walk in them.

XV. That to continue in any known ſin, upon what pretence or principle ſoever, is damnable.

Rom. 1. 32. Who knowing the Judgement of God, that they which commit ſuch things are worthy of death, not onely to do the ſame, but have pleaſure in them that do them.

Rom. 6. v. 1, 2. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall wee continue in ſin that grace may abound? God forbid; How ſhall wee, that are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? compared with verſ 15. and 16. What then? ſhall wee ſin, becauſe wee are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid. Know yee not, that to whom yee yeeld your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants yee are to whom yee obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſſe?

1 *John* 1. 6. 8. If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in dark-

*Act.*22.8. Who art thou Lord? and he said, I am Jesus of Nazareth.

*Act.*2.36. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Iesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ. Vers. 37. Now when they heard this they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto *Peter*, and to the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, What shall wee do? Vers,38. Then *Peter* said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Iesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

XI. That this same Iesus Christ, being the onely God and Man in one Person, remains for ever a distinct Person from all Saints and Angels, notwithstanding their union and communion with him.

Col 2.8. Beware lest any man spoyl you, through Philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

Vers 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulnesse of the God-head bodily.

Vers.10. And ye are compleat in him, which is the head of all Principality and Power. Vers.19. And not holding the head, from which all the body by joynts and bands, having nourishment ministred, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

1 *Tim* 3 16. God manifested in the flesh, beleeved on in the world.

XII. That all men by nature are dead in trespasses and sins, and no man can be saved unl ss he b born again, repent, and beleeve, *Joh.*3.3. Iesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdome of God. Vers.5 6 7. Iesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God; That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye n ust be born again. Vers.10. Iesus answered, and said unto him, Art thou a Master in Israel, and knowest not these things?

*Act.*17.30,31. And the times of this ignorance God wink[illegible] but now [illegible] mandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appoi[illegible] will judge the world in righteousnesse.

*Act.*26.17,18,19,20. Delivering thee from the people, and f[illegible] wh m I now send thee, To op n their eyes, and to turn them f[illegible] and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive for[illegible] inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me. Wh[illegible] obedient to the heavenly V sion, but shewed first to them at *Da[illegible] Salem*, and throughout all the coasts of *Judea*, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent, and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance, *Luke* 24.47. that repentance and forgivenesse of sins should be preached in his Name among all Nations.

Act 20 20,21. I have shewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from house to house, testifying both to Iews and Greeks repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Iesus Christ.

Joh. 5,24,25. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and beleeveth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life. Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall l ve.

CROPPED F

XIII. That we are juſtified and ſaved by grace, and faith in Jeſus Chriſt, and not by works.

Acts 15. 24. For as much as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, ſubverting your ſouls; ſaying. *Yee muſt be circumciſed, and keep the Law*, compared with *Gal.* 1. 6, 7, 8. 9. *I marvel that you are ſo ſoon removed from him that called you into the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpel which is not another; but there are ſome that trouble you, and would pervert the Goſpel of Chriſt; but though we, or an Angel from heaven preach another Goſpel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accurſed.* As wee ſaid before, ſo ſay I now again, *If any man preach any other Goſpel unto you, then that ye have received, let him be accurſed*, Gal 5.

Ver. 2. 4, 5. Behold, I *Paul* ſay unto you, that if yee be circumciſed, Chriſt ſhall profit you nothing; Chriſt is become of none effect to you, whoſoever of you are juſtified by the Law, ye are faln from grace, for we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteouſeſs by faith. *Rom.* 9. *v.* 31, 32. 33. But *Iſrael*, which followed after the Law of righteouſneſs, hath not attained to the Law of righteouſneſſe. wherefore? becauſe they ſought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they ſtumbled at that ſtumbling ſtone; As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence, and whoſoever beleeveth on him ſhall not be aſhamed, compared with *Rom.* 10. *v.* 3, 4. For they being ignorant of Gods righteouſneſs, and going about to eſtabliſh their own righteouſneſs, have not ſubmitted themſelves unto the righteouſneſs of God, for Chriſt is the end of the Law for righteouſneſs for every one that beleeveth

Rom. 1. 16, 17. I am not aſhamed of the Goſpel of Chriſt. for it is the power of God unto ſalvation to every one that beleeveth, to the *Jew* firſt, and alſo to the *Greek*; for therein is the righteouſneſs of God revealed from faith to faith, as it is written. *The* [illegible] compared with *Gal.* 3. 11. But that no man is juſtified by the [illegible] it is evident; for, *the juſt ſhall live by faith.*

[illegible] by grace ye are ſaved through faith, and that not of your ſelves, [illegible] works, leaſt any man ſhould boaſt; for we are his work- [illegible] Jeſus unto good works, which God hath before ordained [illegible] them.

[illegible] in any known ſin, upon what pretence or principle

Rom. 1. 32. Who knowing the Judgement of God, that they which commit ſuch things are worthy of death, not onely to do the ſame, but have pleaſure in them that do them.

Rom. 6. *v.* 1, 2. What ſhall we ſay then? ſhall wee continue in ſin that grace may abound? God forbid; How ſhall wee, that are dead to ſin, live any longer therein? compared with verſ 15. and 16. What then? ſhall wee ſin, becauſe wee are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid. Know yee not, that to whom yee yeeld your ſelves ſervants to obey, his ſervants yee are to whom yee obey, whether of ſin unto death, or of obedience unto righteouſneſſe?

1 *John* 1. 6. 8. If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in dark-

*Chap.*3 vet. 3. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure. Vers. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Whosoever committeth sin, transgresseth also the Law, for sin is a transgession of the Law, And yee know that hee was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin; whosoever abideth in him sinneth not. Whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, neither known him. Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doth righteousnes is righteous; he that committeth sin is of the Devil, for the Devil sinneth from the beginning, for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil.

2 *Pet.*2.19,20. While they promise them liberty they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again intangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them then the begining.

Rom. 8.13. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall dye, but if ye mortifie the deeds of the flesh by the Spirit, ye shall live.

XV. That God is to be worshipped according to his own will, and whosoever shall forsake and dispise all the duties of his worship, cannot be saved.

*Jer.*10.15. Poure out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not upon thy name, for they have eaten up *Jacob*, and devoured him, and consumed him, &c.

Psal. 14. 4. Have all the workers of iniquity no knowledge? who eat up my people as they eate bread, and call not upon the Lord.

Jude verse 18, 19, 20, 21. How they told you there should be mockers in the last time, shall walk after their owne ungodly lusts, these be they who separate themselves, sensuall, not having the Spirit. But yee beloved, building up your selves in your most holy faith, praying in the holy Ghost, keep your selves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.

Rom. 10.13. For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be saved.

XVI. That the dead shal rise, and that there is a day of judgement wherein all shal appear, some to goe into everlasting life, and some into everlasting condemnation.

1 *Tim.*1.19.20. Holding faith and a good conscience, which some having put away, concerning faith have made shipwrack; of whom is *Himeneus* and *Alexander* whom I have delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme, compared with 2 *Tim.* 2. 17, 18. And their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, who concerning the faith have erred, saying, That the Resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some, Act. 17. 30, 31. And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day wherein he will judge the world in righteousnesse.

John 5. 28, 29. All that are in the grave shall hear his voyce, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation; compared with 1 *Cor.* 15. 19. If in this life onely wee have hope in Christ, wee are of all men most miserable.

FINIS. *Imprimatur, Henry Scobell.*

Printed at *London* for *Robert Ibbitson* 1654.

The younger Brothers.

ADVOCATE:

Or a line or two for

Younger Brothers.

With their PETITION
to the *PARLIAMENT.*

By *Champianus Northtonus.*

LONDON,
Printed by *W. W.* in the yeare 1655.

The younger Brothers Advocate, or a line or two for younger Brothers.

HAving long expected (amongst the multitude of papers, and promised Reformations, that these Parlimentary years, and reforming deformed times have produced) to have found some Champion that would have stood up, some Heroicall compassionate spirit that would have taken into consideration the poor and despicable condition and provision of younger Brothers; I thought that there would have been some amongst the reforming Combatants of that fraternity, that would have been mindfull of that so grand a pressure still continuing with us, but whether it be through the multitude of their imployments, or that they have acquired to themselves (great possessions and sufficient maintenance) being now careless and forgetfull of the welfare of their fellow brethren, or whether it be through want of remembrance and ingenuity, as not taking notice of it as so great a grievance, in regard of the long use it hath had with us, there being nothing so absurd in nature, so horrible in it self, or so ridiculous in reason and common sence, which long use will not make plausible and acceptable; custome making good [illegible] and evill good. That it might not altogether be buried in oblivion, and that none hath seemed to be sufficiently mindfull of it, and that

that it appears to me (as yet) ſo diſſonant unto Scripture, and naturall reaſon, ſo oppoſite to common equity, which ought to be the foundation and chief corner ſtone of all Lawes.

I have been moved, though moſt unworthy, though moſt unſufficient, curſorily and as confuſedly to diſcover ſome thoughts concerning it, that which I was moſt unwilling to do, not onely in regard of my diſability with other diſadvantages, but in reſpect of the potencie, and the prevalencie of its adverſaries, though it is a thing worthy my labour, yet my labour is far unworthy of it, for I find every man is not a fit Champion for truth; one may be as truly and really in poſſeſſion of a truth (as a ſouldier of a Fortreſs) yet may be forced to loſe it, but they that beſt can, will not, and thoſe that worſt may ſometimes holds the light. That it ſhould not be forgotten, and ſeeing likewiſe this unnaturall and unequall Law or evill uſe, for I can not call it ſo properly a cuſtom, but a corruption (for as I remember the Lawyers ſay, that *Conſuetudo eſt jus non ſcriptum, nunquam repugnans rationi naturali.* A cuſtome ought not to be contrary to the Law of nature) which by long continuance in the Kingdom hath got ſuch a generall allowance, it being ſo commonly and ſo frequently practiſed, together with the conſiderations of the diſquietneſſe and dangerous effects it often produceth; the diſcord and diſhonor it brings to houſes and families, and likewiſe the miſeries, contempt, and reproach to the younger brothers themſelves; I have adventured to put in view, though in ſo rugged and uneven a manner, theſe undigeſted lines onely as a remembrancer, hinting at things, hoping thereby to put in mind and to awaken the hearts and reſolutions of ſome of that Fraternity, of greater abilities and advantages to purſue it to ſome better reformation.

In which deſign let us not be diſcouraged, nor diſcountenanced, notwithſtanding, our elder brothers are advanced in power and authority above us, but let us rather be animited that our cauſe is juſt, and our determiners we hope not unjuſt, we ſhall not be unreaſonable, let us not deſpair, for greater things then this have been effected: let younger brothers likewiſe conſider, the miſery, the diſeſteem, this uſe, this vaſt difference bringeth on them, the Elder injoying large poſſeſſions, the younger having not ſufficient maintenance, the Elder gentlemen, the Younger beggers, as if they were

baſtards and no ſonnes, ſervants and no children, this is ſo uſually practiſed, that the very name of a younger brother is a word of contempt, and an expreſſion of want and ſlender meanes, and amongſt other Nations reckoned as one of the poor companies, ſome commiſerating their poor condition and maintenance, that the Elder and Younger being bretheren by birth of ſo near relation, of the ſame fleſh and blood, ſhould be ſo ſevered, ſo disjoyned, and ſo far off in fortunes; ſome again deriding at the ill policie of our Kingdome, and careleſsneſſe of ſome Parents in bringing them up as their children, but not maintaining them as their ſons, in giving them a generous breeding, but leaving them a ſlender allowance for the continuance of it, dealing with them as *Pharaoh* dealt with the children of *Iſrael*, that would have them make brick, but would give them no ſtraw, that would have them Gentlemen, but will give them little or nothing for the ſupport and maintenance of it.

This education taking ſuch a deep impreſſion in many, as having firſt taken poſſeſſion in them, (none are ignorant of the force of education) the ceaſing of which is moſt harſh to the ſoul, it is better never to have been godly, then after to turn apoſtate, it is happier never to have been in plenty, then after it to fall into want; it is the ſpeech of depoſed *Dionyſius*, they are happy ſaith he that have been unbleſſed from their youth, it was the wiſh of a noble Queen in miſery, that ſhe had not been of the royall blood; ſo younger brothers may often wiſh that they had been rather the ſons of ſome yeomen then of Knights. They being often left to the diſpoſitions and dependance of their elder brothers, and ſo conſequently ſervants, if not vaſſalls at leaſt to their humours, and many times upon the leſt diſtaſte and difference are caſhier'd, and left to the four windes; It is written the Elder ſhall ſerve the younger, but not that the younger ſhall be a ſlave to the Elder.

Some I confeſſe being more fairly dealt with (as having ſomewhat more conſiderate Parents) by leaving them more certainty, penſion or allowance, not depending ſo much upon the will of the Elder, but commonly it is of that quality and quantity, that it will ſcarcely afford them a ſingle competence, neither is it any waies proportionoble to their Fathers eſtate; it being likewiſe generally of that nature, and their education ſuch, that they

cannot imploy it for their best advantage, so that they are as it were enforced to be idle And if naturall desires prevail, they must be forced either to be one of *Origens* disciples, or intercede for the publick tolleration of Stewes, they having allowance in some Nations as a necessary evill, or else petition for the reedifying of Cloysters, there to live in solitarines from the view of the world, there to be dieted with *Agnu. Castu.* and *Sacru. Saturni*; by the dissolutions of which our Ancestors took away that advantage from us, with others, establishing nothing in lieu thereof.

Now if *viriles appetitus*, are predominant (which God and Nature doth not forbid) they must but Tantalize, and as Prisoners look through the Grate, so that they must either be torne in pieces by predominate affections, burned with feavers or drowned in dropsies; or if they have not the gift of abstinence, they and their children are commonly precipitated into extream indigency and miseries, being forced to lay aside all badges of their birth and education; so that which way soever they turn, *lupum auribus tenent*, they must either burn or starve, which things are most grievous to the soul, and which the temper of many spirits cannot brook. It is better never to have been a *Helen* then after to become a *Hecuba*, the want alone of a foregone joy is troublesome, how much more when it declines to miserable extremities; *Jobs* afflictions were more piercing when hee remembred the daies of old: *David*, a man after Gods own heart, complaineth that his present calamities more compleated his grief in regard of his former freedome; Adversity is in his full strength coming upon him, who formerly hath been prosperous, for the common enduring of miserie dulleth the edge thereof, and maketh it much lesse sensible to him whom custome hath made familiar with grief.

These exigencies having with some such an operation, that when they cannot, it may be they know not how to maintain themselves by honest and lawful waies, are driven to take indirect courses, and by consorting themselves with ill company, acquainting themselves with shifts, and practising how to deceive, hence it is that many are driven to beg, cheat, steal, and many times hanged for theft; then what can be more ignominous, more disgraceful to the Family, the sonns discredit must needs be the fathers disgrace,

and what can be more offensive to the quietnesse of a nation. It is this inequality which compelleth many brave spirits desperately to run into the gulf of discontent, to turn Pirates, Turkes, Fugitives, Hectors, Knights of the blade; nay, any thing, it is like *Polygamy* amongst the Turkes, that hath made almost all the Country robbers, being forced thereunto for the maintenance of their wives.

1. But our insociable Inheritors as one calls them, may say to us, that the Lawes being such, there is no remedie but patience; you must be content, and frame your minds according to your lots, otherwise you do but bite the chain in which you are tyed, and so wrong your teeth.

Thus we see how *Issachar* like, they would have us couch down between our burthen, *sed melior spero*, and perswade us to a stupidity, not patience; It is no breach of content, nor repining against our Maker, for to complain that their sufferings are unjust as offered by men, and by lawfull means to seek redresse, content (as Divines say) is an humble and willing submitting our selves to Gods pleasure, and not to murmure at him, they would deal with us as it is related that Father *Parsons* delt with *Elliot*, who being through his means defeated of his goods; *Elliot* making addresses, and expecting relefe from him, but instead thereof he gave him a lecture of patience, humility, and mortification, and to go into a Cloyster; the usuall Cordialls for discontents in that religion, the benefit of which refuge we here cannot enjoy; but why may not this argument bee retorted upon them, why can not the Elder of many Younger, be content to accommodate their minds, and frame their Education according to the first born of so many younger brethren, and participate of the good and ill fortunes of their Parents, why should it all go upon the score of the younger.

2. But they may further alledge, that this law is not of such a nature, but that it is in the Parents power to mitigate.

Sometimes and in some cases they may, but generally they cannot, especially the Father dying intestate or in his full strength, &c. the elder like a ravenous beast seiseth on all, and leaving but the

the excrements and carkaſe to the reſt; how naked then are they left, they having but part of the goods of which the Nobles and Gentlemen are generall not ſo fully ſtored with, as alſo in caſe of intayles with other devices, which are too tedious to review, but if it be (as they ſay) a law which rather inviteth then commandeth Parents ſo unequally to proportion their Eſtates: We ſee notwithſtanding by manyfold examples, how men generally are apt to incline to the worſt, and how ill examples more in force, then good precepts, they meaſuring themſelves by themſelves, and comparing themſelves amongſt themſelves, but go not according to the pattern, how frequently is this unequall dealings practiſed even of thoſe who have power, ability, and poſſeſſion to do otherwiſe: under a vaine pretext of upholding their houſe and name, contrary to nature, religion, and right reaſon, forgetting their Chriſtian names to remember their ſirnames, not ſo well conſidering that Gods waies and Lawes are the beſt to uphold houſes and Families) eſpecially having a Law and practiſe to back them, and will ſtill be practiſed, unleſſe there be a Law as there is in ſome places, obliging them to the contrary; If you ſay that other Kingdomes have the ſame cuſtomes, I ſay, if they have, they retain them not upon ſound principles, however I am ſure where they do take place, they are allowed greater priviledges, and advantages then is here tollerated.

3. They may likewiſe object to us, that Law being ſo antient, and ſo long eſtabliſhed, and ſo ingroſſed in our Lawes and natures, ſo conſtantly practiſed, that if it be an error, yet *communis error facit jus*, however that it may be difficult and dangerous to alter it.

We cannot deny but that it hath been of too long ſtanding, the more hath been our injurie, but let them conſider, that it is the equity and not the Antiquity of Lawes which makes them venerable, *jus permanebit ſemper nec unquam mutetur, lex vero ſcripta ſæpius*, ſaith *Silvi.* Antiquity is an argument for nothing but truth, equity, and goodneſſe. That Law was eſtabliſhed by corrupt principles, may well and as wiſely be altered by the Suprem Authority, acting upon better principles, true prudence, and policie conſiſting not in an obſti-

nate

nate retaining old customes, but in the electing or relecting, in continuing or changing of forms according to better information and sounder principles, according to the circumstances of times, places, and persons; To what end otherwise do assemblies meet, neither can there be more danger in this, then in the Alteration of other things, the fabrick being to be altered, this may likewise be put into the building.

That it may better appear to be unnaturall and unreasonable, and not agreeable to holy writ, let me go a little further, how it had its first original; Certainly for the Antiquity of it, it will appear but a Mushom of yesterday in comparison of *Moses* division, and *Job*, *Moses* contemporary; you cannot find any such Law or practise before *Moses*, nor long after, but contrary, I am sure from the beginning it was not so. It having had its first institution, when heathen, infidells, or tyrants had the reignes of government in their hand; moved thereunto by tyrannicall and ambitious, and Turkish principles, and in continuance of time the evill customes and examples of such came to be imitated by inferiors, and so turned into Lawes, it being brought unto us by the Conquerror, our more antient Lawes (as appears by *Lucius*, following the counsell of *Elutherius* in making Lawes for his Kingdome) was taken out of the word of God, and grounded on the Law of God and nature, and not so much from the Laws of *Rome*, notwithstanding *Cæsar* in his Com, with other ambitious Romans, attribute so much to themselves for the civilizing of others (as the French now a daies for Apish apparell, we being indeed more then babonish so far to humour them in it, whereby we do not a little undervalew our selves) for saith he, the Lawes of *Rome*, and *Cæsar* may be reproved, but not the Laws of God, as it manifestly appeaes likewise by our Kentish Gavel kind: And I am sure God gave no such direction at the first, as is manifest by the practise and precept of holy writ before and after *Moses*, it is clear likewise that *Abraham* by vertue of the Law of God written in his heart, & the Law of nature, would have devilded his reall inheritance in the promised Land between *Isaac* and *Ishmael*, had he not had a special & extraordinary command (which precept was in relation to the spirituall promise) however those gifts was of such a quantity and quality, that he and his posterity became Princes and Dukes. It is the opnion

pinion of the learned, that *Ishmael* was answerable in outward Estate to *Isaac*, though not in the spirituall promised land, neither was that difference made by *Isaac* and *Jacob* to their Children. *Moses* likewise giveth but a double portion to the eldest; what better Moderator can we have to determine what is unnaturall and unreasonable then this authority, which I hope none dare say but it is of infinite more value then humane reason; it is the saying of a heathen, that Law ought to be the reason and mind of God, differing just and unjust.

But you may say that *Moses* doth not forbid but that the eldest may have more then a double? *Ans.* It appears that rather before this Law was made, Parents were so far from doing as is done with us, that they many times gave not so much to the Eldest as to the youngest, or else divided it, conceiving it may be, that the Eldest having some authority by their Birth-right, and advantage in years above the youngest, would quickly advance their estate to a greater proportion, as also too much lord it over their bretheren, of the same flesh & blood. Now that authority (in processe of time) over their bretheren being decayed, which it may be causing too great a neglect and contempt of him (wise Legislators make their Lawes against those enormities which they see are generally predominate in the people) it was thought fit to enact, that they should have a double portion, which was the mind of God in that case, and if any did deviate from it, you cannot think but that it was a transgression of the Law, for if you observe, you shall find divers Laws enacted in that manner, which they ought not to exceed; but if any did transgresse, it was generally in the minor then major, rather in giving him not so much, then allowing more, as is manifest by their generall practise in the old Testament.

The new Testament likewise holds it forth, as is clear by the younger brothers coming to Christ to divide the inheritance, so in the Parable of the Prodigall, how boldly cometh he to his Father, and saith, *give me the portion that belongeth to me*, and after we read that he divided unto them his living, though these be no absolute precepts; yet it is an instructing parable, and likewise holds forth the customes, then likewise used, by vertue of *Moses* division. It was likewise practised in the first primitive times, as also of later years, as *Constantine* the first Christian Emperor, *Theodosius*, with many others, as may be made good.

This being now likewise the practise of our Neighbour nation, as also of some members nations of this Kingdome, being as they say most agreeable to gods word, and the Law of nature, and so strictly observed, that if some Parents do transgresse, the Magistrate hath power to dispose of it

accordingly, more inſtances might be brought, which for brevity I omit, eſpecially from thoſe who endeavour without partiality to make the Divine word the rule, and ground of their Lawes; For amongſt Chriſtians the teſtimony of Gods word alone and above all ſhould have ſufficient Majeſty to anſwer all oppoſitions; It ſhould be their *ipſe dixit*, in which they ought to acquieſce. What ſuperexcellencie is in the Eldeſt beyond the reſt, they are of the ſame extract, members and branches of the ſamebody, as lawfully begotten, nay, many times more legitimate; hath not God likewiſe in ſcripture often expreſſed more peculiar favours to younger then to the Elder, as to *Abel*, *Jacob*, *Ioſeph*, *David*, &c.

I do not denie but that there is a priority, a precedency of place, a civil reſpect due to the Elder from the younger; And before the Law, a bleſſing and ſpeciall priviledge and prerogative annexed to their Birth, but I have not read that by vertue of that birthright, that then they had power to detain al the inheritance from the younger (much leſſe ought they now ſo to do) *Eſau* ſelling his birthright, ſold not his goods and Lands, but his claim of being Prieſt with other priviledges, after his Father, as for the rule they had over the Family, the world then being in its infancy, that people might not be left to their own fancy, and every one do what ſeemed good in his own eyes, and to avoid confuſion, ſtrife, and emulation; it was then ordaind, that the Elder ſhould have the rule of the reſt, for as the caſe then ſtood, if any order and government, there muſt be a prior and poſterior; it is moſt requiſite and meet, that the Elder (if qualified) rather then any of the reſt ſhould enjoy that priviledge.

This Family-Government about *Moſes* and *Aarons* time (people being more multiplyed) ceaſed, after which time they could plead no ſuch prerogatives, neither then was this priviledge ſo generall and inevitable (the Elder wanting other qualifications to accompany his birthright) that very often the younger was preferred before him.

However they may again alledge: that 'tis neceſſary and convenient that this Engliſh Cuſtome ſhould be continued, for the name, reputation, and upholding the houſe and Family, for a ſanctuary and refuge for younger brothers, and likewiſe that there might be perſons of ſufficient eſtates and abilities for the execution and managing of the offices and charges of the Commonwealth, *&c.*

Theſe allegations may ſeem plauſible and of ſome force, eſpecially amongſt Heathens and Tyrants, which allow many things as commendable, which in a Chriſtian ſtate ſhould be moſt odious, for ſuch ſtates ſquare out

out their form not by pious rules, but by the judgement of their ſenſuall appetites, where any thing is allowable that will help it forward, more reſpecting greatneſſe then equity and goodneſſe, but the impoveriſhing of many for the enriching of one (contrary to the pattern in the Mount) the debaſing and pulling down of many for the elevation of one, eſpecially naturall bretheren, members and branches of the ſame natural body, ſhould not be with us (*conſuetudo Cedat authoritati divinæ*) it is the ſpeech of a Heathen. *Tully* as I remember, that if a law bee made contrary to the Law of God, it is not to be called a Law, though all the world in a joint aſſembly confirm it; we muſt not frame arguments of conveniencie to conclude againſt the teſtimony of holy writ, the ſtate muſt comply with it, and not the rule to the ſtate; it is the preferment of the precepts of divine writ, before humane policie, that diſcovereth ſound Chriſtian ſtates from Athiſticall and heatheniſh infidells.

What naturall juſtice and reaſon is it, that the upholding of the houſe ſhould be onely applyed to the Eldeſt (like ſome Churchmen that count no good done to the Church of God but what is for their peculiar benefit) as if the other were baſtards and no ſons, ſervants, Aliens, and not of the ſame blood and relation; why ſhould the due maintenance of the younger be taken from them to be ſpent upon meer ſtrangers; in haukes, hounds, and that many times *Acteon*-like, they and their children are devoured of them, in Luxurie, Pride, Prodigality, with other exorbitances. Why ſhould the elder brothers multitude of attendance and ſervants be maintained by that which belongeth to the younger brother. None ſhould be deprived of their due, though to build Hoſpitalls, much leſſe to be ſpent upon extravagant humours.

The ſpreading of a Family was held to be one of the greateſt temporall bleſſings, but now many Parents (as it ſeems) conceive it a greater bleſſing to ſuppreſſe the greateſt part, imitating therein the great Turke in ſome meaſure, who for the greatneſſe of one, deſtroyeth the reſt; is not a houſe, a name better upheld by more props then one, that one failing, as very often it doth, then all falls to the ground; is it not an overſight in Parents, that they ſhould be more carefull to provide for the profuſeneſſe, vanity, and unneceſſary expences of the Elder, then the competent and comfortable neceſſities and livelyhood of the younger. As for being a ſanctuary & refuge to

the younger; I cannot but confeſſe, but that many elder brothers, (to their ſuperlative praiſes be it ſpoken) doe deal moſt ingenuouſly in that nature, not onely out of conſcience, but likewiſe moved thereunto by Heroick noble principles, but examples in that kind are rare, generally this Sanctuary proveth but a weake priviledge, a ſlender refuge, feeding them like a bird in a Cage: and too often making them by their unnaturall imperiouſneſſe, to live in an uncomfortable condition, moſt unlike their own brethern. This reaſon is often alledged by many before there be occaſion to uſe them, but then diſclaimed with many pretences, and often like the Devil, pleading ſcripture for their unnaturall inhumanity, though it be expreſly againſt it; Inordinate affections taking place beyond the neceſſities of their naturall bretheren; occaſioned often I confeſſe by their too much uxoriouſneſſe, and eſpecially their wives being of a malevolent genius, and troubled with that Tripl *P.* of Pride, penuriouſneſſe, and perverſneſſe, daily experience manifeſteth, how apt men are to be drwawn away to this unnaturallneſſe rather then meliorated by precepts; how neceſſary therefore is there of a law to regulate them.

For that other plea that they might be of abilities for executing offices, and the Charges of the Kinhdome.

This might formerly have carried ſome ſhew of pretence, when their charges by exactions were far greater; but not near proportionable to that vaſt difference, thoſe offices of charge coming but ſeldome, and not generall, in a manner but once in an age, ſo great expences likewiſe were often occaſioned more out of a profuſe and vain glorious humour, then any waies eſſentiall to their office or charge.

I am ſure great wiſdome is not alwaies accompanied with great riches, however wee need not doubt but men of ſufficient abilities will be found for ſuch charges, who have not many younger brother, to provide for.

But why ſhould the Magiſtracie, offices, and charges of the Kingdome be upheld and maintained by the younger brothers; I am ſure in thoſe ſtates where this unequall diſtribution is not practiſed, Magiſtrates are maintained with reverence, office, and charges, duly executed, and juſtice as impartially adminiſtred; if they cannot be executed but with ſuch charge and majeſty, let it be born by publick contribution, as in other places, for as they ought not to conſume and impoveriſh their inferiours, ſo ſhould not they exhauſt themſelves, for this cauſe ſaith *Paul*, pay you tribute. Thy

They will however object against us, for the upholding of this unnaturall custome, that industry might not decay, that having so weak means, we might be thereby provoked to imployment?

A. We ought to be driven in imployments upon better principles, then by injuring us being innocent; the same argument may be reverberated upon them, why should they have a writ of ease from industry; their profuseneſſe and ill examples often causing more idleneſſe, and doing more injury to the Common-wealth, by breeding idle attendance; why should not the Elder of many younger submit to providence; why should the witts of the younger be so much put upon the wrack and tenterhookes, and their small alowance often put upon hazzardous adventures, thereby if they can to enable them to live in some good manner, and in some proportion to the sonns of their Father; may not the Elder advance their Estates, they having not onely advantage of meanes, but likewise an other double advantage of us in their Education and years; the Parents often being taken away, before the younger are acquainted with the affairs of the world, for the better managing of their poor pittance, which causeth them very often to receive a foyle, they being then driven *Nolens, Volens,* to be idle or do worse.

The younger brothers idleneſſe arising more for want of means and due Education, which being rectified, they cannot, they will not be idle; let not their sufferings be counted a fault, however their idleneſſe may be prevented at first by the discretion and policie of Parents, as in other Countries who more industrious and thriving then they.

They have likewise another objection to encounter with us, which is that threefold distinction (which some make of *Moses* Law) of Morrall, Ceremoniall, and Civill or Judiciall; The ceremoniall that being wholly abrogated by divine precept; the Politick or Civill, that being not binding to us, but framed particularly for the Common-Wealth of the Jewes, and that it is left to the prudence of every nation to-

eſtabliſh conſtitutions of their own, ſo that the Morall part is onely now obliging to us.

If according to this diviſion it be not of force, why is the obſervation of it of ſuch power with us, and ſo much preſſed upon the conſcience, by ſome meerly upon that account (as may be inſtanced in the degrees of marriage with other things) it being by this notion no waies obliging to the conſcience, but it ſeems ſometimes it is binding, ſometimes not; neither do I conceive ought it to be ſo far neglected, in this particular as it is, ſo much diſreſpected and troden under foot; for certainly ſuch lawes, that have their firſt inſtitution and practice, from the moſt juſt, equall and naturall grounds, and from the beſt and moſt excellent Authors, are orought to be ever in higheſt eſteem and accompt, and imitated of all wiſe, vertuous, conſcientious, and temperate ſpirits; ſo ſhould the contrary bring much diſcredit and diſregard unto thoſe cuſtomes that have their firſt originall from corrupt and barbarous principles: Now the wiſdome of God eſtabliſhing this, *Moſes* receiving it immediately from God, (not at the ſecond hand) not in a viſion and dream, but mouth to mouth, which is the cleareſt and fulleſt revelation. In which inſtitution, there is nothing, ceremoniall, Judaical, or Typicall; but being of a morall nature, hath a perpetuall morall equity and juſtice in it, founded on the Law of nature, and right reaſon (which ought to be alike in all places.) Thoſe lawes are juſt and equall (ſaith that learned, pious and judicious Divine, *Pet. Du Moulin*, which being founded on nature, are conſentaneous to the Law of God; Is it not apparent likewiſe in St. *Matthewes* Goſpell, that no uſage, or cuſtome ought to deſtroy a right ground upon an univerſall law of God.

As how can there be an example of greater and more reverend authority, and better rule of reaſon and naturall juſtice, a ſurer way for the prepetuating of Families, who promiſed it as ſo great a bleſſing; certainly his bleſſings and laws are not contradictories; let us not make our ſelves wiſer then our maker.

Nay

Nay, is it not a queſtion made by ſome, whether or noe this cuſtome of ours be not a national ſinne againſt the eighth Commandement; for according to the opinion of the learned, it hath relation to the Judiciall or Civill lawes of *Moſes*, they being branches and particular explanations of the morall law; And you know publick eſtabliſhment and connivence, or Common practice, and a generall inſenſibleneſſe, maketh ſins to be national; let not the Mahometan ſhame us, they follow their Alcaron; let not us ſo much prejudice the teſtimony, authority and practice of the ſcripture, and primitive times, and reformed Churches, nor ſo far forget our principles.

So that I cannot ſee, but that a more equall diviſion, then is gerally practiſed with us amongſt brethren, is more agreable to ſcripture, right reaſon, naturall juſtice, and no prejudice to the flouriſhing condition of a Nation, and true happineſſe of a Commonwealth.

Let us therefore make our humble addreſſes unto our Legiſlators, who make ſo great, ſo many profeſſions, and proteſtations of protecting and promoting natural juſtice equity, and liberty, that they would be pleaſed to take into conſultation this our ſad and deplorable condition, this grand Monopoly, ſo filendy remaining yet amongſt us, that either there may be a more equall diſtribution, (then now is generally uſed) in ſome proportion to our Parents Eſtates and conditions amongſt brethren, or that ſome equivalent expedient, may be found out for us; that we may not be more ſuffering, and more injuriouſly delt with, then the younger bretheren of other Nations, (who have made much leſſe profeſſion then wee) there being in thoſe Countries (where a more equall diviſion is not practiſed) ſome ſpeciall priviledges, prerogatives, and advantages peculiar to them, as alſo Monaſteries, Nunneries, with other helps and proviſion, which here now we have not, and which at the firſt originall of this cuſtome with us we did enjoy; Parents then often uſing that way of proviſion for their younger children, thereby (according to the humour, and mode of thoſe times) rendering them in a leſſe deſpicable condition, and more comfortable ſubſiſtance then now, all which being taken away, this cuſtome notwithſtanding

ſtanding continueth without any ſupply.
why ſhould not younger brothers receive ſome benefit of the freedome and liberty which is ſo much pretended?

Let us likewiſe offer to their conſideration, that a more harmonical diviſion & proportion wil not diminiſh the ſtrength, honor nor happineſſe of the Kingdome, but may rather encreaſe it, and likewiſe cauſing Parents to be more provident and moderate in divers exorbitances, as alſo how that the clear rayes and principles of our religion hath diſpelled villenage (ſo that now it is become the beſt tenure) let it likewiſe take ſome place in this, which to ſome is little better, and laſtly let them conſider the perpetuall honor and renown, that will redound to them for it, and how they will perpetually engage and oblige, not onely no ſmall number, but thoſe likewiſe generally of good reſolutions.

Now if thoſe our applications ſhould be rejected with repulſive compliments (Dominion I confeſſe being ſo tempting a bit, and ſo pleaſing a morſell, that it too often tempteth the moſt temperate palates); and that we find no other redreſſe then good or ill language, let us leave no ſtone unturned, but let us notwithſtanding make our further ſupplications, that either we may have ſome peculiar priviledge in ſome generous way or calling here, or elſe in ſome noble undertaking, or plantation abroad, by a publick countenance and aſſiſtance, where we wil frame a policie and government according to our own mode, and eſtabliſht decrees and conſtitutions of our own, which for the preſent I ſhall omit, leaving all to the conſideration and wiſdome of our Superiours.

FINIS.

THE GREAT CASE OF TRANSPLANTATION IN IRELAND DISCUSSED;

OR

Certain Considerations, wherein the many great inconveniences in the transplanting the Natives of *Ireland* generally out of the three Provinces of *Leinster*, *Ulster*, and *Munster*, into the Province of *Connaught*, are shewn.

Humbly tendered to every individual Member of Parliament by a well wisher to the good of the Common-wealth of *England*.

LONDON,
Printed for *I. C.* 165[illegible].

The great Case of Transplantation in Ireland *discussed* &c.

THE planting of *Ireland* is the subject of many mens Desires, most mens Discourse, of few mens Endeavours; some of these few, deeming themselves lead by Principles of Religion, in order to the purity of the Gospell, some by principles of publique good, in order to the preservation of the English Nation and Interest entire; Some by Principles of Advantage, in order to the fixing English Estates, where the hazard may be least, and profit greatest, urge earnestly the transplanting of the *Irish* (pardon'd for Life, and to continue in the Dominion) into *Connaught*, as the first expedient in order to the well planting of that Land; to which purpose divers Orders have at sundry times issued, but others, who embrace the same Principles, and are also desirous to be lead by them, conceive this conclusion, at least inconsequent (if not contradictory) to those premises, and for this perswasion, humbly offer these Considerations.

Concerning Religion.

First, if the Physitians and Attendants must necessarily cast out the Patient whensoever any hazard of infection is possible, all diseases are desperate: But the unitive

principles of Christianity teach us, that separations of persons, are then onely Lawfull when necessary, and then onely necessary when the malignity of the poyson is greater then the vertue of the Antidote, or obligation of duty. Here two things then ought to be weighed.

First, whether it be more probable as things now stand, that the Irish Papists should pervert the English Protestants, or that the English Protestants should convert the Irish Papists.

Secondly, whether the English *Protestants be more obliged by any special duty to continue many of the* Irish *Papists (though the probability of infection were greater) than by that general fear and probable hazard to remove them.*

The consequent of the first disjunction seems most probable on these grounds.

First, Natural Conscience makes all persons, who stand in awe of a Diety, preferre some Religious External Observations before none; When therefore no toleration is given to the exercise of Popery, and the Reformed Religion publiquely professed throughout the Nation, it is very conceivable that Natural Conscience may perswade many Papists (at least) externaly to frequent the Protestant Assemblies, and many have been woon in the Ordinances, who by external Motives were first induc'd to them; But what Temptations in such an Instance may invite Protestants to turn Papists, is not conceivable.

Secondly, By the Cruelty of the Papists in the late Rebellion, the Protestants are more confirmed against Popery (as the Original of those Cruelties) and by those heavy Judgments wherewith God hath avenged the blood of his Servants; The Papists themselves made less in love with that Profession which lead them on to those

those cruelties, and thereby provoked these judgments; in this instance therefore it is much more probable, Papists should be converted than Protestants perverted.

Thirdly, when God intwists his interesse with man's, man is commonly so inamoured with his own, that in such a case he is not apt to leave God's; and such is the present case in *Ireland*, it is not even for the civill interests of Protestants to turn Papists, it is for the Papists to turn Protestants.

Fourthly, in time of peace, when the highest externall inducements, ran on the Papists side yet many Irish were reduced to Protestanism, for every one English seduced to Papism.

Objection, Against this some may perhaps pretend, *That the Papists in* Ireland *are hardened in their Idolatry, and few of them converted of late.*

Answer, First, that it is not strange if onely few of them be converted, yea it is even wonderfull that any of them should of late be converted considering,

First, the heavy pressures under which they have groaned to the very grinding of them, by which means more families have been destroyed under the protection of Protestants, then in opposition against them.

Secondly, the many divisions among those who are called Protestants, and bitternesses of those who are thus divided, because by the former the Papist sees not where to fix if he should come to us, and because of the later he sees not what friends or security he could partake if the should fix.

Thirdly, the intire neglect of sending forth instruments to instruct them; it is sad observe how Garrisons are placed in every quarter where the Irish inhabite, Ministers in none; as if our business in *Ireland* was onely to set up our own interest, and not Christs.

Fourthly, the lamentable ignorance of most and blasphemous hæresies of some, who have been employed and allowed publick maintenance, in Protestant congregations, under the notion of Preachers.

First, so that if the Irish Papists be hardened, we must blame our selves for it. 'Tis certain that in these few places, where Ministers make it their work, to deal with them and to remove those gross scandals out of the way, they find them, more pliant and flexible to submit to scripture directions, then some of those who complain of their hardness.

Secondly, who art thou who complaines of their hardness? didst thou ever pray for their softning? if no, mourn for thy own hardness, if yea, labour for what thou hast prayed, and presume not to cast the dust off thy feet till thou hast thus laboured. Many fearing God, and studying the spiritual advantage of those poor natives, are confident that the Lord's harvest in *Ireland* is farr more then the Labourers.

Thirdly, the blade appears not above ground, assoon as the seed is sown; supernaturall habits are infused after the manner of acquired; after good husbandry hath been used, stand still awhile, and see what increase the Lord will give; nay what he has given; Many of them desire now, earnestly, to put their Children into the Care of the English of qualitie adjoyning to them; offer largely to their maintenance in the Education of the Religion and manners of England; I shall not search mens hearts to censure, the doing this for sinister ends; who knows but God may have softned and convinc'd them by his rod; But this is certain, The means is good (though their ends are bad) and God may bring a good end out of that too; The son may be sincere, though he father be a hypocrite, and what his earthly father intended

tended onely for the saving his estate, his heavenly father may advance to the saving of his soul.

Objection. But some may be employed to instruct them as well in Connaught, *if they should be transplanted thither, as if they be not transplanted.*

Answer, First, those that shall be employed, must be either such as are already in the other parts of *Ireland*, or out of *England*: If the first, they must be either Ministers, or Gifted men; For the Ministers, they are so few, that they suffice not the places inhabited already; And for the gifted men, although they (might possibly be spared hither without any considerable loss in them, and to convert heathens (as they count the Irish) were a fitter work for new Apostles (as they count themselves) then to pervert Christians, yet 'tis probable they may be as unwilling to preach, where there is need of them, as they have been forward to intrude themselves, where there was no need of them; But alas, they must first stay at home, and be some years catechiz'd before they go, that so they may be learners before they shall be teachers, Rayling at Ministers, Ordinances, and all the reformed Churches observations will perswade the Papists, they are men of their own Religion, not that will turn them from it; And other Divinity these know not; and for Godly learned Ministers to be brought out of England, to go among the Irish, will sure be a difficult work, when we find it so hard to invite any to come among the English.

Secondly, the company of professors is a powerfull engagement to profession, the setting of brands together, and some already kindled to these unkindled, is the way to get heat, when the spirit of the Lord is pleased to blow them.

Thirdly, mans soul is like a narrow mouth'd bottle, the means

means to fill it, is not to pour buckets of water over it, but to take it singly, and pour in the water gently by little and little; publick preaching may be compared to the former, but private catechizing and family duties to the later.

If then these Papists be suffered to continue in the English plantations, they may enjoy the labours of Godly able Ministers, the encouragments of Protestant professors, and the Catechizings of private Christians, all which are powerfull morall instruments to conversion; but if they be transplanted, as their consociation may probably settle them on their old lees, so their separation certainly deprives them of these advantages; And by a persistance in their former Principles, continue them Papists still, or by a forgetting them (if possible) and no better distil'd into them, make them turn Atheists.

Secondly, Let us consider whether there be not some speciall obligations which in conscience and religious duty more binds us to continue these poor Natives (though Papists) with us, then that general fear and possible hazard of infection binds to transplant them (especially since these have been shown to be but Panick.)

It is a clear Maxim in Christian Religion, that we must not commit a less sin, though it were to avoyd a greater; in evils of suffering the less is eligible, in evils of sin none is aligible; if then this Act of transplantation be sinfull and contrary to these obligations which lie on us, the avoydance of future infection will not acquitus, it will not free us from the guilt of murther, to kill our selves, lest another should kill us. Consider then, That many of those who are thus punished with the guilty, are guiltless at man's Tribunall, which onely judgeth of outward expresses, the heart and intention thereof being peculiarly subjected to the judgment of God who onely

can

can only ſearch it; many are ſuch as not only did not act againſt the Engliſh in the Iriſh Rebellion, but did eminently act with them, and for them; and were inſtrumental, not only in the ſerving of ſome privat perſons (which might be the reſult of particular affection) but alſo of ſecuring ſome, & reducing other publique places of ſtrength to the power not onely of the Engliſh Nation, but of the Parliament; and ſhall theſe Innocents be puniſhed with the Guilty? the Lord would not deal ſo with *Sodome*, Heathens did uſe to remark with great Rewards, thoſe who in common Cauſes abſtained from common defections; they that forgot the Bonds of Relation, Religion, and Nation, in the day of our Weakneſs, ſhould not be forgotten in the day of our Powr's. Is it an equal Crime to act with and againſt the Engliſh Nation? Why then is there an equal puniſhment?

Objection. *The avenging of blood is of ſtrickteſt obligation, and the Iriſh in the Late Rebellion having contracted a national bloud-guilt, no eye muſt pittie them.*

Anſwer. Firſt, if by Nation be meant the greateſt part, the aſſertion is true; but if it be every individuall, then it was ſhewn before, that there was a difference in acting, and therefore ſhould be ſo in puniſhing.

Secondly, Nationall guilt is expiated by nationall judgements; the wickedneſs and bloud-guiltineſs of *Benjamin* did not neceſſitate an univerſall deſtruction, but 25000. being ſlain, wayes are ſtudied to preſerve the remainder.

Thirdly, particular bloud-guilt of private perſons, is expreſsly excepted from pardon by that act

of Settlement; which vouchsafes pardon to others; and as it is unjust that those who are pardoned, should suffer for the guilt of those who are not: so it is unnecessary that punishment should be inflicted in common, when triall of the guilt and execution of the guilty may be single.

Fourthly, if all murther be unpardonable, and this whole nation be in that degree, guilty of murther, as renders them unpardonable, then no punishment inferiour to death is proportionate uuto their guilt; to which it is consequent, that the transplanting them into *Connaught* is unjust, as in the defect being less then that guilt or obligation to punishment, so in the excess removing them from the English, by whose evidence alone the Courts of Justice can proceed to their triall; and therefore tends more to their pardon then punishment.

Fifthly, that even murther is in some cases pardonable, appears by the practise of all States & Armies. *David* did not unjustly to pardon *Abner*, who yet made it a sport to shed bloud; and by the nature of the thing it self, for every unlawfull breach upon man's life is murther, and every Abettor of that breach is guilty of the same murther: since then war may be unlawfull on both sides, but is not ordinarily on both sides lawfull, either the war must continue whilest one man therein ingaged survives, or the guilt of murther is in some cases pardonable.

And if in any cases, then certainly in these two.

First, when the guilt was for most part contracted, either through ignorance or infirmitie.

Secondly, when the pardon directly leads to publick good, and the sparing of a few to the preservation

ſervation of many; The former ingredients make the guilt leſs evill, the later ingredients make the pardon more good. And in the preſent inſtance both theſe concur.

Firſt, the Iriſh nation were generally ingaged in the Rebellion, either through ignorance of the deſign, and apprehending they acted by the King's commiſſion, and for his and God's ſervice; or through infirmitie, partly fearing their Prieſts threats, partly their Land-Lords frownes, partly the violences of others, of the Engliſh who at the beginning reckoned an Iriſh man and a Rebell tantamount, and on that ſcore forced many into war, (who deſired peace) with the Iriſh in armes, who accounted and declared all Enemies, that joyned not (at leaſt ſeemingly) with them, and proceeded with more ſeverity againſt diſſenting natives than Engliſh.

On the cleering of this objection from juſtice, hangs indeed the whole weight of the controverſie; And therefore the doing it ſolidly, can be of no mean concernment; the way will be, by Conſidering of the Reſolution, that the law gives to two or three queſtions, and the application of them to this preſent affaire.

1 *What puniſhment is, what are the ends thereof, and whether and in what Caſes it may be annulled or Abridg'd.*

2 *In what kind of puniſhments the Rulers or generality of a Nation may involve the Commons or each particular.*

3 *How long puniſhment againſt a Nation is to be continued.*

To the firſt, Puniſhment is the evill of ſuffering

enjoyned for the evil of doing. The ends thereof are commonly mistaken, men making punishment the end of punishment, & the gratyising either the Law it self (which is without sence of the satisfaction) or God (who delights not in suffering, as such) or the party injured (the scratching of whose itch, in the way of revenge, barely, is utterly unlawfull) the truth is, an injury done is unrepealable, and neither God, nor the law of Reason delights in accumulation of suffering, or are pleased with pain (barely as it is paine) Reason dictates, man must do nothing to hurt another man, unless it have some good end, and in the paine of the Enemy alone so nakedly considered, there is no good but false and imaginary; Therefore were it not for whats to come, the Law would never punish (though the greatest crime, for whats past, for thats irreversible, Therefore the sayings of the wise men are, we must come to vengance, not as it were sweet, but profitable; some things are honest simply, some upon necessity, of which sort is punishment; No wise man inflicted a punishment because a fault is done, but that it may be done no more, for justice is not Anger but Caution; to devise how one may bite him that bites us, is the part of a beast; from whence (it follows) although you do no injury, though you punish an offence, yet you likewise do no injury, if you do not punish (unless in connexion with the ends) contrary to the vulgar, who are as inexorable as *Nemesis*, and thinks him the justest man, that like *Draco*, writes all his Laws in Blood. Now the ends of punishment are these three. 1. That the Offender may be rescued from lapsing into the same fault for the future.

2. The

2. The Offended from future injuries; And 3. Example to all by the penance of few.

From whence it will follow (to the third head) contrary to the Stoicks judgement, who say (that punishment is due to the offence, and a wise man gives every one his due, and therefore no delinquency should scape) by better reason, there being not alwaies a juncture of those ends with suffering, That sometimes it may be taken off, or relaxed; Before a penal Law will not seem so strange, but even after a penal Law likewise. If the ends for which punishment was ordained in a moral estimation be not necessary, or if other ends on the opposit part occur, not less profitable and necessary, or if the ends proposed by the punishment may be attain'd any other way.

Answerable to these reasons were their actings: when God gave the Law, he deprived not himself of all power, but reserved a liberty to pardon; none can put any one to death without Law, nor any but the Supream pardon them, sayes another; and this mercy they dispenc'd on these two cautions of Violence and Ignorance, where they found them; for that these take off from voluntary, and that from guilt.

Now if strict Law give thus much scope for mercy, what ought mercy and goodness, which should be in all to their like; but especially when Evangelicall Law (goodness and mercy) commands this too.

To apply this first particular to the case of the Irish, it will thus state it, as was declared before, that though their crimes have been heinous, yet they

are to be punished onely with reflexction (not on their evill past, but the good to come) and then onely if no other way will compass this end, but their punishment, and then onely in such a degree as they are found capable of the diminutions of punishment, Iignorance and Violence; and certainly neither of these will be denied, but that as a great part of them acted through ignorance, so the force of an Army levied was sufficient to compell the rest, &c.

2 The second question is Answered thus; Magistrates may contract guilt from the Commons, theyvicissively from their Magistrates and heads, or Rulers, & in sharing in the publick crime, must in the punishment; But it is to be noted likewise, that there are publick punishments and private for example (as when a Common-wealth is overthrown, it suffers a publick death; reduced to a Province, undergoes slavery, a City loses its Walls, Shipping, Officers, Treasure, Laws, Ensigns, Magazines; in sharing these each particular may suffer; But that particular men for the offence of a Community without their consent, should lose the things that are proper to themselves is unjust; publick offences brings publick punishments particular guilt, particular suffering.

Apply this second to the Irish, and let the active ruling part be distinguished from the passive subjective, and publick punishments from particular, and justice is done.

The last question is thus satisfied; How long a Commonalty shall be prosecuted with justice; shall punishment be alwayes exacted while the community last?

No:

No: Thoſe being extinct by whom merit was derived to the Community, the merit it ſelf is alſo extinguiſhed, and puniſhment cannot conſiſt without merit; You may account it a ſufficient puniſhment that none of the offenders are now alive (ſayes the Civil Law) It is a miſtake in mans dealings (though with God juſt) that becauſe Children receive honours and rewards for their fathers good deeds, that they ſhould be puniſhed for their evill; Becauſe a benefit may without injury be conferd on any, but ſo cannot a puniſhment.

This decides the laſt part of the Scruple, touching the Iriſh, for the bloody perſons (known) are all dead by Sword, Famine, Peſtilence, the hand of civill juſtice, or remain ſtill lyable to it, or are fled beyond ſea from it; The Prieſts and Souldiers (the kindlers of the war in the beginning, and fomenters of it ſince) are for the firſt univerſally departed the Land, and for the ſecond, to a vaſt number, and the moſt dangerous, & the remaining, are weary of war, having long ſince ſubmitted, and thoſe that are out, ſue for nothing but mercy; for the poor Commons, the Sun never ſhined (or rather not ſhined) upon a Nation ſo compleatly miſerable; There are not one hundred of them in 10000. who are not by the firſt and fourth Articles, of the act of ſettlement under the penalty of loſing life and eſtate; The Tax ſweeps away their whole Subſiſtence; Neceſſitie makes them turn Theeves and *Tories*, and then they are proſecuted with fire and ſword for being ſo. If they diſcover not *Tories*, the Engliſh hang them, if they do, the Iriſh kill them, againſt whom they have nothing to defend themſelves, nor any other.

other that can; nay if any perſon melted with the bowels of a man, or moved by the Rules of Common Equitie, labour to bring home to them that little Mercy which the State allowes, there are ſome ready to aſperſe them as favourers of *Tories*, coverers of bloud-guiltineſs; and briefly, in a probable computation five parts of ſix of the whole Nation are deſtroyed, and after ſo ſharp an execution, is it not time at length to ſound a retreat? Muſt we ſtill cry juſtice, juſtice? wherefore is juſtice ſo invok't againſt them? was it not for cruelty? God has aveng'd it; let others take heed how they become guilty, eſpecially they that aveng'd it; The fair vertue of juſtice (overdon) degenerates into the ſtinking weed of Tyranny, Beaſts ſcorn the humble Prey; Heathens having Conquer'd by Juſtice, have conquer'd again by Mercy; The State does intend a Cordial for that Conſumptive Nation; it is onely deſired they would be pleaſed to accelerat it, leſt by dying before, they loſe the opportunity of ſhewing they would at laſt have had pitty.

Secondly, that the Pardon of this national Blood-guilt is ſubſervient to publike good, and in order thereto ought to be extended to all ſuch as are obnoxious to no other guilt than what is Common and National, may be evidenced by diverſe arguments; but in regard they conclude in like kind, againſt the tranſplanting of the Iriſh, into *Connaught*, it is opportune to proceed to the ſecond inſtituted compariſon, whether it be more conducive to the publick good of the Engliſh Nation, and to the preſervation of them intire, to continue the Iriſh or tranſplant them? Conſider therefore.

2. *Concerning Publick Good.*

THE publick good of *Ireland* respects either the publick Revenue, or the good of the present, or of future English Inhabitants and Planters.

First, For the publick Revenue. The Revenue or Contribution of *Ireland* is generally raised out of Corn, and the Husbandmen of that Corn are generally Irish, the removal therefore of these necessarily infers the failer of that. For,

1. The Irish, who raise their Contribution out of Corn, live themselves on the roots and fruits of their Gardens, and on the milk of their Cows, Goats, and Sheep, and by selling their Corn to the English, provide Money for Contribution; if then the Irish should be thus transplanted, their Corn would not be vendible, not to one another, for all would be Sellers, not to the English; for to carry it 50, 60, or 100 miles to English Plantations, would make it so dear to the Buyer, and cheap to the Seller, that it cannot reasonably be thought practicable.

2. The Lands of *Ireland* are generally so unapt for Corn, without much charge in manuring them, and the Harvest-season so catching, without many hands to save the Corn, that the first Crop seldome (if ever) makes the Husbandman a Saver: if then the Irish be removed from their Lands prepared for Seed, to the waste and uncultivated Lands of *Connaught*, the Lands they leave can pay no Contribution for the first year, because they will become waste till others inhabit; and the Lands to which they remove can pay none, because (being waste) they

must spend a year of their time, and much of their principal Stock to improve them, before they can derive any suitable profit out of them.

Secondly, For the present Inhabitants, Souldiers, and others.

1. The Souldiers lately disbanded (especially the private Souldiers) have neither Stock, nor Money to buy Stock, nor (for the most part) skill in Husbandry: But by the labours of the Irish on their Lands, together with their own industry, they may maintain themselves, improve their Lands, acquire Stock, and by degrees inure themselves suitably to that course of life: But the transplantation of the Irish leaves these poor mens proportions of Land totally wast, and unless they can, like *Nebuchadnezzar*, live on Grass, they must perish, or sell too too cheap their dear-bought recompence.

2. The other Inhabitants, by the labours of the Irish Tenants or Servants, are enabled to contribute to the publick charge, and maintain themselves and Families in some measure: But the transplantation of the Irish will utterly deprive them of all manner of livelyhood; and as the destruction of the English already planted in *Ireland* is a sad evil in it self, so in its consequence it can be no encouragement to other English to plant.

3. Considerable numbers of English Families, (upon the hopes they had of peace and quietness) have already scattered themselves into the Country, laid out (what they saved thriftily, or got hardly all this long time of languishing) to begin a new Fortune with) on purchasing Farms, buying Stock, building Houses: But now this early hope must be

nipt in the bud; for if transplanting goes forward, (it will so multiply *Tories*) the English cannot possibly live in the Country, and their Stock cannot possibly live in Towns, and their Improvement and Buildings must be utterly lost, and themselves totally (when they least feared it) undone.

4. The Army, and all the Inhabitants, derive their Bread, Meat, Drink, all the most necessary means of living, from the labours of the Irish; and if these be transplanted, then they must either fall with their own weight, or purchase such supports out of *England* at rates too high for their condition, or leave the Land.

Thirdly, For future Inhabitants, Adventurers, Souldiers, and such others as shall engage in the planting of *Ireland*. The first and chiefest Necessaries to the settlement and advancement of a Plantation, are those natural riches of Food, Apparel, and Habitations. If the first be regarded, there are few of the Irish Commonalty but are skilfull in Husbandry, and more exact than any English in the Husbandry proper to that Country. If the second, there are few of the Women but are skilfull in dressing Hemp and Flax, and making of Linnen and Woollen Cloth. If the third, it is believed, to every hundren Men there are five or six Masons and Carpenters at least of that Nation, and these more handy and ready in building ordinary Houses, and much more prudent in supplying the defects of Instruments and Materials, than English Artificers. Since then 2000 Acres of Land (Plantation measure) being but of indifferent goodness, with the rest of the Lands

in *Ireland*, shall require as much Stock as whose original price and charge of transporting will amount to 1500 or 2000l. Since likewise Husbandmen and Tradesmen that are laborious, can subsist by their Labours and Trades comfortably in *England*, and most will not probably leave their native soyl on any terms; and those who will, on extraordinary terms. It is necessarily consequent, that the transplantation of the Irish doth not onely deprive the Planter of those aforementioned advantages, but also so exceedingly aggravates his charge and difficulty in planting (by his irremedicable want of whatever he brings not with him out of *England*) that his charge will manifestly appear to be more than his profit; and it is not easily conceivable how or when five or six Millions of Acres are like to be planted or inhabited upon so clear an account of expence and loss.

Objection. *Against all these advantages it is onely objected, that the English may degenerate, and turn Irish, unless a separation by transplanting the one from the other be observed; and to this purpose experience of former ages is urged.*

Answer. Of future contingents no man can pass a determinate judgement; but if we speak morally, and as probably may be, it may much rather be expected that the Irish will turn English. Those Topicks before instanced concerning Religion do inferr it as very probable, that with the Religion professed by the English, it is likely they may receive their Manners also. And this is confirmed by experience of all of that Nation who embraced the Protestant Religion. And as to former experience,

even

even that likewiſe ſeems to add weight to this expectation, becauſe whatever inducements perſwaded the Engliſh formerly to turn Iriſh, the ſame more ſtrongly invite the Iriſh now to turn Engliſh.

1. When *England* was reformed from Popery, no care was took, nor endeavours uſed to ſpread the reformation in *Ireland*; by which means the Engliſh Colonies there continued ſtill Papiſts, and ſo in Religion were alienated from the Engliſh, and and faſtned to the Iriſh: But now it being moſt probable that moſt of the Iriſh will embrace the Proteſtant Profeſſion, it is upon the ſame grounds moſt probable that they will embrace the Engliſh Manners.

2. Former Conqueſts of *Ireland* were either the undertakings of ſome private perſons, or ſo managed by publick perſons, that the power and profitable advantages of the Land remained in the hands of the Iriſh: But as in the preſent Conqueſt the Nation of *England* is engaged, ſo is the power and advantage of the Land in the hands of the Engliſh. For inſtance.

1. The Iriſh were the Body of the People, and too potent for the Engliſh (eſpecially at ſuch times as the troubles of *England* cauſed the Armies to be called thence, which Hiſtorians obſerve to have been the times of degeneration, as a means to ſelf-preſervation.

2. The Iriſh were the general Proprietors of Land, and an Engliſh Planter muſt be their Tenant; and the temptation of this relation and dependence is very prevalent (at leaſt) to bring the Poſterity to a complyance, and that to a likeneſs, and that to a ſameneſs.

3. The

3. The Irish were the chiefly estated, and the intermarriages with them were accompanied with greater Friends and Fortunes than with the English, who were not onely Strangers, but for the most part (till of late years) comparatively poor.

4. The Lawyers were Irish, the Jurors Irish, most of the Judges Irish, and the major part of their Parlament Irish, and in all Disputes between Irish and English, the Irish were sure of the favour.

But now the condition of *Ireland* is (through Gods goodness) so altered, that all these Arguments are much more forcibly perswasive, that the Irish will turn English.

3. The frequent use of the Irish Language in all commerce, and the Englishes habituating themselvs to that Language, was one great means of Irishifying the English Colonies: But now the Language will be generally English; and if the Irish be mingled with the English, they will probably learn and be habituated to the English Tongue, which is found by experience to be suddenly learn'd by the Irish; whereas if they be transplanted into *Connaught*, the distinction of the English and Irish tongue will not onely be continued, but also the Irish left without means of learning English.

3. *Concerning the Security of the English; and their Interests.*

1. FOR the present, This Plantation will necessarily make many *Tories*. For,

1. Many Inhabitants, who are able to subsist on their

their Gardens in their present Habitations, are unable to subsist in travelling to *Connaught*; and for the present to derive subsistence from the waste Lands of *Connaught*, when they come thither; and therefore will rather choose the hazard of *Torying*, than the apparent danger of starving.

2. Many Irish Masters will disburthen themselves of their attendants and servants on this occasion, in regard the charge of retaining them will be greater, and their imployment of them less, both in the journey, and journeys end; and these servants, however disposed to honest labour and industry, yet being thus secluded from means of subsistence, necessity will enforce to be *Tories*.

3. The range of the *Tories* will be so great, and advantages thereby of securing themselves and Cattel so much, that untill the whole Land be otherwise planted, it will not be probable that our Armies should either have intelligence of their places of abode in their fastnesses, or be enabled to find them; those who are acquainted with the service of *Tory*-hunting, know much of this difficulty. And impossible it is, that those parts of the Land which adjoyn to those Fastnesses, should be planted in many ages, if *Tories* (secured in them) make incursions on such as shall plant.

4. The Irish numbers (now so abated by Famin, Pestilence, the Sword, and Forein Transportations) are not like to overgrow the English as formerly, and so no fear of their being obnoxious to them hereafter: but being mixed with, they are likelyer to be swallowed up by the English, and incorporated into them; so that a few Centuries will know

no

no difference present, fear none to come, and scarce believe what were pass'd. The chiefest and eminentest of the Nobility, and many of the Gentry, have taken Conditions from the King of *Spain*, and have transported at several times 40000 of the most active spirited men, most acquainted with danger and discipline of War, and inured to hardness; the Priests are all banished; the remaining part of the whole Nation are scarce the sixth part of what were at the beginning of the War, so great a devastation has God and Man brought upon that Land, and so far are they from those formidable numbers they are (by those that are Strangers to *Ireland*) conceived to be; and that handfull of Natives left, are poor laborious usefull simple Creatures, whose design is onely to live, and their Families, the manner of which is so low, that it is a design rather to be pitied, than by any body feared, envyed, or hindred.

Secondly, For the future. By this Transplantation,

1. The Irish Commonalty are put under the power of those Chiefs, who have engaged them in so much Blood in the late Rebellion.

2. They are collected into one Rendezvouz, and so fitted for an united undertaking, when occasion shall be administred. *Scilurus*, his Arrows might easily be broke singly, but bound in one bundle, they abide any stress.

3. They are seated in a Country furthest distant from *England*, and for the Sea-shore most remote from the course of the English Fleet, where therefore they may receive Arms from any Forein Prince with most security, modelize themselves into Arms, and

and be furnish'd irresistably for a new war; by means of these advantages, the English in the last Rebellion first lost *Connaught*, and last regained it.

Fourthly, they exceedingly mistake who imagine that the passage out of *Connaught* into the other three Provinces is difficult, or may be easily defended against the Irish, if they should thus be armed and fitted for a new war.

Whereas it is evidently for the securitie of the English and English interesse, to divide the Irish one from the other, especially the Commonaltie from the Cheifs, and both from the advantages of receiving probable assistans from Foreiners.

Objection. *But notwithstanding many of these inducements to joyn with the English, yet many of the Irish have of late turned* Tories, *by means of this cohabitation.*

Answer. The mistake is great in attributing that effect to this cause. The reall causes of those later *Tories* are such as these.

First, the Common-wealth's necessitie for money to maintain the Army of *Ireland*, brought the protected people under a tax so insupportable, that the generalitie of them were forced to a monethly diminution of their principall substance, which by degrees brought laborious husbandmen to so sad a state of povertie, that they were necessitated to this hard choice of starving or turning *Tories*.

Secondly, Lawes were imposed on the protected to discover and resist Enemies upon pain of death although they neither had nor were allowed Armes or means to inable them to it, or defend themselvs; nor could the Law-givers protect them ei-

ther in their estates, or lives, from that Enemie to whose malice and fury the observance of those Lawes made them liable; so that both the contempt of, and obedience to them, exposed these poor people to be punished with death either by the English or Irish.

Thirdly, the violence and oppression by some of the Souldiers inflicted on them is incredible; and by the injured people's just fear to complain, many horrible facts of this nature go daily unpunished.

Fourthly, the narrowness and streightness of the Parliaments concessions of mercy to that Nation in the first and fourth article of the act of Settlement, which doth not declare one in 500. pardonable either for life or estate; and when men see a line of destruction measuring out their portion, nature teaches them to perserve their lives as long, and sell them as dear as they can, by resisting to the uttermost, the power of that state whose declared resolves exempt them from all mercy.

Object. *But if this toleration of Irish cohabiting be allowed, the Adventurers and Souldiers (it is feared) will acquiesce in them rather than expose themselves to the expence and difficultie of transporting and planting with English.*

Answ. All the Irish, and all their stock is not proportionate to the fifth part even of the three provinces, and therefore cannot satisfie the proprietors ends, of planting their land; though being advantagiously dispersed and disposed of, they may be instrumentall by their labours, and industry, to make preparation for, and to facilitate the settlement of such others as the planters must necessarily

sarily bring thither for the full improvement of the Land.

Thus we see no necessity of this transplanting, in regard of the three great ends alledged, Religion, Profit, Safety, but rather so great a necessity of them, that there's no reason at all for it.

But there is one thing more which wise men will consider, and that is, the impossibility of this transplanting. Among the five things, Impossibilities are one head that are excluded deliberation. There are Laws made, and Orders gone out, for their going Universally into *Connaught* by *March* next; But suppose they should have a dram of Rebellious blood still in them, or be sullen and not go; It is not impossible but this may be so, nay it is certain it will be so, for they were by Orders to remove long since, and yet an inconsiderable part onely obeyed, the generality choosing to run all hazards obstinately, than condescend.

They say they can but find want and ruine, (at the worst) if they stay, and why should they travel so far, for that which will come home to them? can it be imagin'd that a whole Nation will drive like Geese at the wagging of a hat upon a stick; but there's an Army to compell them; I, this is the way to have an Army, nay to have two Armies, one more then we would (of the Enemies) and then perhaps to have one less then we would again, never a one of our friends; Surely more English Souldiers have perisht by the Countrey, then the Sword of the Irish; They are more afraid of *Tories* then Armies, and Woods and Boggs then Campswhere; It will be harder to find them then vanquish them; And

when will this wild war be finished? *Ireland* Planted, Inhabitants unburthened, Souldiers setled? at this rate who will be able to stir abroad for fear, to live at home for want? And when a dangerous experiment has been tryed, it may be Quiet will be sought at a dearer rate then it might be found now; It's a sad thing to fight against men till they are reduced to us, & then to fight against them, because they will not part from us.

And that this is certainly the true state of the controversie (and not any dregs) of Rebellion in them unpurg'd, yet will by this evidently appear, that those whom Fear or Want has made lately to swell the number of the *Tories* so much (to shew their disposition to quietness) did at their first going out, and do still continue to offer securitie for their peacable demeanors in the English quarters, if they may be accepted, and to take the first opportunity, to go beyond sea for Souldiers. And if this will not be granted, who knows what desperation may make them willing to do, and us unwillingly to suffer?

Although to discover so many monstrous and evident dangers and losses necessarily impending upon the generall removall of the Irish out of the three Provinces into *Connaught*, and not against small fingle, but such severall great Interest, *viz* the continuing the Irish Papists, or making them turn Atheists, the knitting again like Worms their divided septs and amities which are now cut in sunder, the entailing barbarousness upon them by such a consociation for ever, the giving them power to rebell again by crouding them all together, and will, by the great

injury they conceive they have in this action, againſt, which they have ('tis ſtrange) as great a reſentment, as againſt loſs of eſtate, yea even death it ſelf. The aſperſing the Engliſh Nation with Cruelty, ungratefulneſs, and in ſome ſort unfaithfulneſs. The deſtruction of the States Revenue, the ſtanding Army, the disbanded Souldiery, former Engliſh Inhabitants, preſent Adventurers, and future Planters.

Though it were enough to repreſent barely a *Hydra* ſo pregnant with miſchievous heads, to have it cut off, and new reſolutions to ſucceed thoſe which have been before, and invention to project on all hands upon what ſurer grounds an action of ſuch moment may be founded: yet if the Parlament ſhall be pleaſed but ſo much to reſpect the good meaning of what is here written, as (by their clemency paſſing by all the infirmities thereof) to let the reſidue fall under the cognizance of any perſons deputed thereto. There are likewiſe Expedients ready to be humbly tendred, if they may be accepted, which offer at leaſt at the aſſoyling all theſe difficulties and diſturbances, and the putting that whole Land (by Gods bleſſing) into a quiet and flouriſhing eſtate: but it was judged more convenient to exempt them from the publication of this Paper, that the Parlament might neither ſeem to have their Wiſdomes foreſtall'd, if they ſhall adviſe on other Expedients, nor their Counſels revealed, if any thing offered there ſhould happen to find favour in their eyes.

There are ſome things wherein the Reader is to be premoniſh'd, to ſtop his wonder how ſuch deſtructive Reſolutions could paſs, or be let paſs from the hand of Authority all this time. For which conſider,

1.

1. Those that were in *England* must see and hear with their eyes and ears that were in *Ireland*, and according to Informations given from them, were necessitated to square their directions to them: Now it is no wonder if those that were but Strangers to that Land should not (at first sight) understand the compleat interest thereof; and so though their wils were zealous to that which was good in the general, yet their understandings not fully inform'd (so soon) might cause them to deviate in some particular.

2. When these Resolutions were at first taken to transplant the Irish universally, the face of things much differed in *Ireland* from what it appears now; and that might be conveniently propounded (nay done in one time) which will not so well suit with the series of Affairs at another: then Necessity might have made it fit to have transplanted, now the unfitness makes it not necessary: So that both the one and the other might have been just and unjust, as they were accommodated to several times and conditions. It is impossible for men to foresee all things; Events failing from what was preconceiv'd, may make Counsels vary from what was precontriv'd.

3. Though those that sate at the Helm saw it necessary in their Wisdomes to give out such Orders in those times, yet in their Goodness we see they did not think fit to execute them even till this time, as if they did wait a time to be gratious to the Irish Nation, and would expect all opportunities that might enable them therein, and any new accidents intervening, that would conspire thereto.

And now (God having put the same into their hands

hands at present) it is the earnest suit of many, and ought to be the desire and prayer of all moderate and sober Christians, that he would put into their hearts to embrace and use it; That Mercy may be remembred in the midst of Justice, by those who themselves desire not Justice without Mercy, and that thoughts may be had of what indulgence is due to the frailty of a man, as well as what severity to the obstinacy of a Rebel; it being an Heroicknes not to insult upon an humbled Enemy, and Wisdome not to make him desperate.

The conversion of that Nation will be a more pious work than their eradication, it was that was pretended, fasted, prayed, preach'd for so often; sure it was intended. God hath complicated our good with this mercy, as if he would not let Men be too cruel to those poor blind Natives, without being so to themselves; and would reward their compassionate thoughts towards them with the many good effects that will thereby accrew.

The unsetling of a Nation is an easy work, the setling is not, it has cost much Blood and Treasure there, and now Prudence and Mercy may accomplish the work; the opportunity for it, will not last alwaies, 'tis now; the Physicians late assistance despairs, where his early help might have been prosperous. The Souldiers (there) exhausted with indefatigable labours, hope now for their rest. The old English, having lain so long under Taxes, wait for their Jubile. The Adventurers expect some Crop at length, from what they have long since so plentifully sown. The State may challenge a Revenue from what she has so amply expended on.

It

It had been better *Ireland* had been thrown into the Sea before the first engagement on it, if it will never turn to account, but still to expence: but the time is come when the Venture will defray the expence of the Voyage, if all be not shipwrack'd in the Harbours mouth; all there contrive quietness, pray for peace. This Transplantation is the main *Remora* that puts to a stand. The Seed-time was, the Harvest would come on. The Spring will hasten after so sharp a Winter. And how glorious a Victory will that be, when both the Bodies and Minds of a Nation are overcome! the first by power, the second by love? How will the Souls of the Irish blush hereafter, that they should have been once cruel against those, whom they find still so mercifull towards them: when Love shall hold a stricter rein upon them than fear, and make them wash away that Blood they have drawn from others, by Tears drawn from themselves. How shall they bless God for their Unprosperousness, and rejoyce in those Infelicities whereby they are made happy? And the English that are in that Land bid past cares, and fears, and present wants adieu, and leave those Hives they have been almost starved in, like industrious Bees, to repair their old Stocks with new Honey. How at ease will the State be from those cares, that, like Vultures, have continually preyed upon their hearts in the behalf of that Land? And what a pleasing sight will it be to *England*, instead of meagre naked Anatomies, which she received driven from *Ireland* in the beginning of a War, to empty her self of her young Swarms thither in the beginning of a Peace? If Antiquity deceive us not,

that

that Land was once called the Island of Saints; and if Novelty deceive us not again, it may find as ſtrange a change to good, as it had a fall to ill; God has made (in the nature of Inſtruments) the good or ill of thouſands beneath, to hang upon the breath of a few that are above. O, what a guard had there need to be on their lips, whoſe words diſpence death! what prayers to God! what uprightneſs towards Man! If any Errours be committed, thoſe on the right are eaſyeſt cancell'd; It is better to ſave one innocent, than deſtroy many guilty perſons: but to make guilty perſons become innocent (by ſaving) how excellent will that be? How much more comfort will the heart receive hereafter, to hear the once poor erring Iriſh live good Proteſtants, honeſt Subjects, than to have heard they dyed blinded Papiſts, bloody Rebels? And there can come no glory from that ruine which may be avoyded. The moſt contemptible things carry Engins of death along with them; a Gnat, a Hair, a Raſin-ſtone can deſtroy, but great glorious univerſal agents (like the Sun) are the Parents of life; A ſtorm or accident may throw down a houſe, but art and induſtry are required to build it; and this way treads a deſtructive path, as hath been ſhewn, and therefore ſhould be no longer trodden in; God grant they whom this concerns moſt, may be as ſenſible of it, as ſome are whom it concerns leſs; that they may mind this Affair according to the greatneſs of its conſequent (which ſlights all mediocrity) and will be tranſcendently good or evil; and as Comets may reflect obliquely upon vulgar men, but more eminently ſignifie for great Perſonages, ſo theſe

effects may be showred among the Common People, but will be poured upon the head of the Commonwealth. But I had forgot that I had said before, that Transplanting is an impossible work, and therefore it is enough to pray (and may hope to prevail among wise men) that they would be pleased to leave undone that which they are not able to do, which I take to be a reasonable and modest request.

FINIS.

THE DISSWASIVE FROM THE ERRORS of the Time,

Vindicated from the Exceptions of Mr. COTTON and Mr. TOMBES.

By ROBERT BAILY Minister at *Glasgow*.

LONDON, January. 4.
Printed by *Evan Tyler* for *Samuel Gellibrand*, at the Golden BALL in *Pauls* Church-yard, 1654.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE,

Apologizing for the Authours long ſilence.

THough it hath been my lot theſe by-gone yeares, often to preſent my weak conceptions in print to the eyes of the cenſorious world: yet I and others with me know my great averſeneſſe and conſtant diſinclination from ſuch publick appearances, and making of any noyſe with my voice or pen, in this exceeding clamorous and tumultuous generation.

The ſenſe of my own weakneſſe, the ſilence of many whom I knew for parts and abilities much fitter for publick ſpeaking, the fruitleſneſſe, or rather the bitter fruits of the pamphleting of the moſt, the weightineſſe of my daily charge, that permits me little by-time, the lamentable poſture wherein the heavy indignation of God hath put all my publick relations, ſome ſad viſitations alſo in my own family, made me reſolve on an obſtinate ſilence for the future, at leaſt while this dangerous and evill ſeaſon did continue. That of Amos 5. 13. *did oft occurre [therefore the prudent ſhall keep ſilence in that time, for it is an evill time] alſo that command of the Lord,* Eſay 26. 20. *[enter thou into thy chambers and ſhut thy doors about thee, hide thy ſelf as it were for a little moment, untill the indignation be overpaſt.]*

Who would not now keep cloſe within the doors of their ſanctuary, and bind themſelves with cords to the horns of the altar? What gracious ſpirit will not now find it prudence to have their eyes ſo fixed upon God, and their eares ſo attentive to his mouth, and their voice ſo ſpent in prayers at the throne of his grace, as in ſome meaſure to be blind, deaf and dumb, yea dead to all that is done or ſaid in the world abroad, without the Lord, their ſweet habitation and ſafe dwelling?

When the other year Mr. Richard Watſon *was pleaſed to ſtigmatize me, in his* Acoluthus *printed at the* Hague, *by the formall title of a ſchiſmaticall and ſeditious reviler of the Reverend Father in God the Lord Biſhop of Derrie his book; and poure out upon me by name, all the venome and gall which any the moſt malignant ſpirit was well able to vent in 204. pages: though the goodneſſe and wiſdome of a moſt noble Prince ſhould not have ſuppreſſed, as his Highneſſe was pleaſed carefully to do, ſo helliſh a firebrand, yet it was my reſolution to have poſſeſt my ſoul in patience, and to have bound to my ſhoulder that book of mine adverſary, as a crown, without return of one word to ſo malicious a man, who had overwhelmed me with a flood of reproaches, for no*

cauſe at all but my ſober and true defence of the juſt proceedings of the Parliaments of England and Scotland, againſt the violence of the adverſaries of their ſolemn League and Covenant.

When about that ſame time Mr. Cottons judicious and grave, but ſad and ſharp enough oppoſition to the firſt part of my Diſſwaſive had fallen in my hand, my purpoſe of ſilence was not thereby broken off: for beſide the forementioned reaſons, I had a particular unwillingneſſe to enter the liſts of ſtrife, with that reverent, famous, moſt able, and tight Writer.

Farther, though his book was chiefly againſt mine, at leaſt more of it then two parts of three (for of his 148. pages, 104. fall to my ſhare alone) yet in all this but a very ſmall part of my Treatiſe is dealt with; the bulk of it is left untouched, though flatly contradicting the congregational way, and Mr Cottons arguments by name, wherein his intereſt was as great as in theſe few pages which alone he is pleaſed to undertake.

Shall I adde this farther cauſe of my ſilence here? when I had run through the body of Mr. Cottons anſwer, ſo much unſatisfactorineſſe at the firſt glance therein appeared to my mind, that I was content to leave the determination of the whole matter to any intelligent and imprejudicate Reader, without all reply.

Towards that ſame time (as I remember) I received a long and very bitter letter from Mr. Tombes againſt a few lines, at moſt a very ſmall portion, ſcarce one page of the ſecond part of my Diſſwaſive; upon my former grounds I gave him no anſwer, yea with him was I minded to have no dealing at all: I took him, as he now avowes himſelf to be a man of contention, who carried Pelidæ pectus cedere neſcii; I ſaw he had upon his arme a number of moſt able Oppoſites; I thought it needleſſe to thruſt my ſelf into that croud.

But while I am in theſe thoughts, Mr. Tombes uſes a ſtratagem againſt me, which indeed hath broken all the bonds of my reſolved ſilence, and drawn me almoſt by violence out of all my lurking holes.

I was patient enough to let Mr. Cotton ſay to me what ever he thought fit, and Mr. Watſon to anoint me with all the reproaches his malicious ſpirit could invent, and Mr. Tombes himſelf to print me ſo many falſe accuſers as he pleaſed: all this I could and did endure, ſecure enough in my own mind of Gods and the worlds judgement in theſe criminations. But when Mr. Tombes did preſſe me ſo ſore, as to commence againſt me a printed proces of falſe accuſations before the Provincial Synod of Glaſgow, and the generall Aſſembly of Scotland, my true Superiours and very proper Judges; I could no longer be dumb, but ſo violented, at laſt I do open my mouth and hope to take off all Mr. Tombes challenges, to the reaſonable ſatisfaction of the indifferent Reader.

And being again in the courſe of ſpeaking, I will endeavour alſo to do Mr. Cotton ſome reaſon, and that by Mr. Tombes permiſſion, in the firſt place, hoping he will not make it his twenty and ſecond challenge againſt me, that I poſtpone him to Mr. Cotton. For I do not deny that Mr. Cotton hath, and ever hath had, ſince firſt I heard of his way, ſo high an eſtimation in my mind, that I do preferre him to all my Oppoſites, and heartily wiſh all differences betwixt me and him were ſo fairly compoſed, that with him I might ſtand no more in terms of any conſiderable oppoſition.

As for Mr Watſon, his dealing with me hath been ſo unchriſtian, yea, ſo uncivil, that I hope to be excuſed in my neglect of his railing, and in my leaving that field unto him to triumph in, without an adverſary, ſo long as he thinks good.

Mr.

Mr. COTTONS first Chapter concerning my Title of Diſſwaſive from the Errors of the Time conſidered.

Dr. HOMES *extraorbitant overlaſhing.*

I Meddle not with Dr. HOMES Preface, wherein he will have me to take what here I am to deal with for arguments of no leſſe then *ſteel, and that unſheathed and ſhining, evident and unrepliable, thundering and fulminating from the hand of a Champion for verity and innocency, even of a mighty Gyant in Religion*, but my own Writs as *aſperſing blots upon precious Saints, to wound ſore the mayes of Chriſt through thoſe Saints ſides, to abuſe the eyes and eares of my readers, and to warp their judgements from the ſimplicity and ſtraightneſſe of the truth*: Such Thraſonick teſtimonies and Therſitick cenſures were put before Mr. *Cottons* book without his knowledge, at ſome thouſand miles diſtance, which readily he will not own.

Mr. COTTONS *clear diſpatation on the threſhold.*

As for Mr. *Cottons* firſt Chapter which examines my title, not only he approves that title, but proves my work to be bleſſed; only he diſallowes, that I reckon up Independency among the Errors of the time: What here may be my faile, this is not the place to debate it; only I take it for too hard a cenſure, that ſuppoſing my miſtake of the nature of Independency, yet this my error, common to me with all Divines old and late, a very few excepted, ſhould not only be accounted a curſed opinion in it ſelf, but ſuch as doth bring a curſe upon all who believe it, even upon all my credulous readers: this is too heavy a ſentence to drop from Mr. *Cottons* pen in his very firſt paragraphs; yet let it ſtand, if any ſolid reaſon can be brought for it.

What here is alleadged of the curſe of *Noah*, may well be an Allegorick alluſion of a pretty wit, but I take it for no convincing argument to ſtand in the frontiſpice of a book, for inforcing of ſuch a terrible concluſion. Muſt Independency not only be ſo ancient as *Noah*, but alſo proclaimed by him in the bleſſing of *Shem* for a bleſſed truth to be embraced by all in after-times who deſired a part of *Shem's* bleſſing? And muſt we conceive *Noah* to have darted the curſe of *Canaan* in any reall purpoſe, againſt the way of the reformed Churches oppoſite to Independency? Surely they muſt have a ſtrong credulity, whoſe heart can ſerve them to believe ſuch ſtrange aſſertions. Is it not granted on all hands, that what ever may be ſaid in the New Teſtament, yet in the Old the Church of the Jewes by divine inſtitution and command, was truly National, wherein all the particular Synagogues were ſubject by divine Right to the general Aſſembly, and ſupream Court of the *Sanedrim*; who had

right from God to compell all within the bounds of that Nationall Church to ſtand to their ſentence? Did *Noah* intend in the curſing of *Canaan* to proclaim a curſe upon bleſſed *Shem*, in the chief and beſt of his poſterity, the children of *Iſrael*, for no fault at all, but following the commands and inſtitution of God contrary to Independency?

But let us conſider how Mr. *Cotton* does prove his aſſertion; the chief tenets of Independency are two; the firſt about the qualification of Church-members, requires no more, but that *Cham*, and *Canaan*, and ſuch, may not dwell in the tents of *Shem*.

The queſtiō concerning the qualification of Church-members, miſ ſtated by Mr. COTTON.

Anſwer. Will Mr. *Cotton* indeed give us aſſurance, that the Independents require no more in this point, but that ſuch graceleſſe ſcorners as *Cham* and *Canaan* are to be excluded the congregation? if ſo, our firſt and greateſt controverſy were fully agreed: for none of us did ever plead for the membership of *Cham* and *Canaan*, of openly ſcandalous perſons, ſo found and declared; all of us were ever content that the curſe of *Noah*, the excommunication of lawfull ſuperiours, ſhould paſſe on all ſuch clearly wicked and curſed children.

But that which here is in debate, is a farre other matter. Mr. *Cotton*, as I prove at length in my *Diſſwaſive*, *cap.* 6. when *Cham* and *Canaan* are caſt out, will not allow us to keep either *Shem* or *Japheth* within their tent doors: their pious and charitable act in covering their fathers nakednesſe, and much more of that kind, will not, according to congregational principles, obtain them any room in a Church: but beſide all theſe outward practices, not only *Noah* himſelf, but his whole family behoved to try them in the ſtate of their true grace and regeneration, without ſatisfaction in this deep enough myſtery, at leaſt to the plurality of the whole family; neither *Shem* nor *Japheth* were to enter their Fathers tents; nor any of their children to remain in their own tents. This divinity, as we take it; is nothing ſo ancient as *Noah*, nor any of the bleſſed truths contained in his bleſſing.

Mr. COTTONS *evident miſ-interpretation of* NOAHS *bleſſing.*

As for the ſecond branch of the congregational tenet, touching juriſdiction and conſtraint, how doth Mr. *Cotton* find it in *Noahs* bleſſing? do Independents teach that no man may be conſtrained without divine perſwaſion in his own mind, to leave any way of error, were it the damnable Paganiſm of the poſterity of *Japheth*, to joyn in a Church with the Jewes, the ſeed of *Shem*? is not this the full length of the woſull toleration of the times, much larger then many of the practiſers themſelves will avow in words that they do defend? Shall Papiſts, Familiſts, Antinomians, and all ſuch be allowed by *Noah*, and all other lawful ſuperiors Civil and Eccleſiaſtick, a full liberty to avow all their damnable errors, till God perſwade their own mindes to acknowledge the truth? What ever Mr. *Williams* and ſuch like do print and practiſe of ſuch a vaſt lawleſſe and illimited toleration, yet we believed that the Magiſtrates and Divines of *New-England*, and none more then Mr. *Cotton* had been much of the Presbyterian ſenſe in this Article, though Mr. *Williams* did print their tenets bloody and more bloody, and themſelves perſecutors for practiſing according to our common and uncontroverted tenets.

If Mr. *Cotton* be not pleaſed to extend the divine perſwaſion of *Japheth* to come into *Shems* tents, unto the relinquiſhing of Paganiſme, and embracing of Chriſtian Religion, mainly in the matter of doctrine and worſhip, which is the clear genuine and confeſſed ſenſe of the propheey; but will inſiſt on the point of Church-government alone: yet how can any truth contained in theſe words of *Noah*, countenance Independent diſcipline, or oppoſe their adverſaries? Were not the tents of *Shem*, the

National

National Church of the Jewes? doth not *Japheth* stand for many Nations that came of him, and so for all the National Churches this day, at least in Europe? Be it so that the union in government of the Churches of Jewes and Gentiles, yea of all National Churches one with another, yea of every particular Church in one Nation with a Sister-Church, were by voluntary association: does this conclude that there can be no divine Right of jurisdiction of the whole over any particular part? that an oecumenick Councel of the Church Catholick of Jew and Gentile, that a National Assembly, or a Provincial Synod in a Nation, can have no power of jurisdiction over any particular member of their association? Had *Noah* no power to cast the Curtain of his Tabernacle over the head of any of his children, except themselves did consent? might not *Shem* have drawne with a fatherly violence and a fatherly correction all his own seimes which before his death were many millions, and *Japheth* also all his, within the compasse of their own tents; their own power and government? can no Ecclesiastick discipline be exercised without the consent of the delinquent party? In a particular congregation where men have entered of their own free will, may they not be cast out whether they will or not? But why should we coy in chasing the parts of a newly devised and groundlesse Allegory? such serious and Topick arguments, can give no strength to a cattle, and scarce become the gravity of Mr. *Cotton*.

I did never count Independency the greatest of errors.

What Mr. *Cotton* observes in the end of the Chapter, that I make Independency the most dangerous error of the time, because the most of my book is spent upon it, there is no weight in his inference. I esteem indeed Independency an error dangerous enough: yet that the first part of my *Dissuasive* ran most upon it, as the second did upon Antipædo-baptisme, was because they were the most prevalent errors of the time and place I then lived in: also because Independency made it self a porter to let into the Churches all other errors; and when they were let in, did lay down grounds for keeping them in for ever, destroying all effectual means which have been used by Christians in any by-gone time, for casting them out when they became incurable.

Mr. *Cottons* second Chapter concerning *Brownists* considered.

SECT. I.

MAster *Cotton* in his examination, pitches on nothing in my Dedicatory Epistle, nor in my Preface, where to he thinks fit to affixe any note of dislike. I should be glad if I might conclude his approbation of all in my book, to which he enters no dissent, nor expresses any contradiction.

The comparison of English Bishops, with Lutheran Superintendents.

In my first Chapter I did derive the *English* Liturgy, Ceremonies and Episcopacy, from the *Lutherans* in *Germany*, upon sundry probable arguments: all these Mr. *Cotton* passes; only he tels me of a vast difference betwixt *Lutheran* Superintendency and English Episcopacy, the one ruling by a Monarchicall power, the other by an Aristocratical Presbytery; does this hinder the derivation of the one from the other? that the power of Bishops in *England* was farre greater then of the Superintendents in *Germany*, what is that to my discourse? albeit the *Lutheran* Bishops in *Denmark* and *Swedane*, seem to have as great power both

in Church and State, as the *Engliſh* were wont to poſſeſſe. Alſo *Engliſh* Biſhops were wont to deny their Monarchical power, and profeſs the adjunction of Presbyters in moſt of their Acts, both of Ordination and Juriſdiction: and in *Germany* (if ye will except the Eccleſiaſtick Senates, conſiſting of more civil Lawyers then Preachers, and both theſe ſet up by the free will of the Prince, and depending on him alone) the *Dutch* Superintendents in their country-adminiſtrations have no Presbyters at all to aſſiſt them, in Acts either of Ordination or Juriſdiction, ſo farre as yet I have learned.

But that which in this Section is moſt inſiſted upon, is, that I make the *Browniſts* the progeny of the Anabaptiſts. My firſt and chief arguments for this are paſt over, and only my laſt and leſſe principal are ſpoken to: I ſaid the conſanguinity of *Browniſme* with Anabaptiſme, did appear by the frequent tranſition of the one to the other. I illuſtrated this by the ſimilitude of Ice and Snow coming of water, and returning again to water. What needed here any profound diſcourſe of the tranſmutation of creatures one into another, and of divers diſtinctions, of remote and propinque, natural and ſupernatural tranſmutations, by putrefaction, or without putrefaction?

That Browniſme deſcended of Anabaptiſme, Mr. Cottons groundleſſe denyall.

What I ſaid, needed no proof at all: that the tenets of the *Browniſts* were borrowed from the Anabaptiſts, was demonſtrated without argument by ocular-inſpection of both their doctrines, wherein the Anabaptiſts were firſt, the other but followed as their Seconds.

Mr. COTTONS very needleſſe debate on Phyſicall tranſmutations.

That among the laſt of my arguments, whereupon *Mr. Cotton* does pitch, which I bring but *ex ſuperabundanti*, the frequent tranſition of Separatiſts to Anabaptiſme, is very probable; and what is brought againſt it is of little weight. I ſaid not that Anabaptiſts uſe to turn Separatiſts, but that numbers of Separatiſts go oft beyond *Browniſme* to full Anabaptiſme. Anabaptiſts need not turn Separatiſts; for remaining Anabaptiſts, they are full Separatiſts, and ſomething more. As for my ſimilitude it holds forth all intended by it; as ſnow by its eaſie tranſition into water, ſhewes clearly its original from water, ſo Separatiſts turning eaſily and very oft Anabaptiſts, ſhew their firſt fathers to have been Anabaptiſts. What here is oppoſite of putrefaſaction, needs not much Phyſical debate; the Snow and Ice are not diſſolved into water, without a true corruption of that ſubſtance which they were before; every generation is after a corruption, *unius generatio eſt alterius corruptio*: beſide this, whatever a corruption a Separatiſt undergoes when he proceeds to Anabaptiſme, all his tenets of ſeparation does fully abide with him; no putrefaction is here, in theſe he is not altered at all. Need we here queſtion the plain word of God, and for ſalving its truth, bring forth diſtinctions? is it not the Lords own plain Logick, thou ſhalt return to duſt, becauſe thou waſt duſt? that ſometimes worms grow of the fleſh of man, it hinders not the diſſolution of his bones, and other parts of his body whiles immediately, whiles mediately into the elements, eſpecially the earth. And though the Lord created mans body ſupernaturally out of the earth, yet this hinders not the earth to be a natural ingredient in mans body; the compoſition of every mixt body, requires naturally and neceſſarily that predominant element to be an immanent principle whereof it was made, and in which it may be, and if God prevent not, it muſt be diſſolved. But how unneceſſary were theſe ſpeculations to our preſent debates?

SECT. 2.

SECT. II.

Of the first separate Minister, Mr. *Bolton*.

IN the next Section Mr. *Bolton* is spoken of; I said he was the first Author of separation in *England*. Mr. *Cotton* tells me of a separate congregation thirty year before him out of the Register. *A.* Though separatists should be so old, it is not material to our questions: albeit it does not appear that the congregation mentioned in the Register, was before *Bolton*, the particular year of *Bolton's* separation, is no where I know expressed; only *Robinson* in my quotation puts him in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*, and Mr. *Cottons* citation from the Register, makes the first separate congregation to have been in the year sixty seven, which was the ninth of *Elizabeth*: so that for all which Mr. *Cotton* brings from the Register, *Bolton* might well be the first Separatist in *England*. Albeit I intended no more but to put him before *Brown*, who had the first finding, noted and considerable separate flock; that of *Boltons* seems to have been so obscure, and so quickly dissolved, and he to have pleaded so little for it, and nothing at all in print, that he got not the honour (or rather dishonour) to have the Separatists called by his name; this he left to *Brown* his successor, perchance more then thirty yeares after his death.

Whether Bolton *a self murtherer was the first Separatist in* England.

As for the congregation named in the Register, some would take it for the very same whereof *Bolton* was the first leader. But having looked upon the Register, I think it more likely, that the forenamed congregation was never any Church of the separation: it was indeed a company of people who refused to communicate in their Parish Church, because their Minister was a known Papist: beside this, the thing that troubled them was not a set Service, but the corrupt ceremonies; for they avow all their Service to have been the Book of Common Prayer of *Geneva*, which they desired still to use for Sacraments and prayers. They avow in that Register their full consent with the Churches of *Geneva* and *Scotland*, who are well known to have been alwayes farre from all separation. They declare also their desire to continue the Service they had in *England*, during the *Marian* persecution; as for their celebrating of Sacraments by themselves in private, the Register mentions no such matter; it seems they were not fixed in any such practice; and if any thing of this kind hath been done by them, they have soon past from it: Surely in all we read in the Register, there is no foot-step of any separation; yea these zealous witnesses against Episcopal corruptions registred in that book, were the chief Champions against separation, and the great hinderers of it down, when after by *Brown* and *Barrow* it began to be set up; as Mr. *Cotton* himself does testifie particularly of *Hildersham's Dissuasive*, Chap. 3.

Whether Boltons *self murther be any just prejudice against his way.*

I said farther of Mr. *Bolton* the first Minister of separation, that to the great disgrace of that way, he had hanged himself. Mr. *Cotton*, which to me seems strange, will not let this truth go, but labours too much to enervate the scandall of it by the testimony of Mr. *Brewster*, who granting that *Bolton* had recanted his separation, and after hanged himself, yet alledges, that he had done this from remorse of conscience for leaving his separation: and so Mr. *Cotton* will have his self-murther to be a testimony for the advantage of separation, as *Judas* his hanging himself

self was for Christianity: *A. Brewster* sayes not that *Bolton* recanted his separation against his conscience, nor that he hanged himself in trouble of conscience for his recantation, and though he had said so, yet *Boltons* case was no wayes like *Judas*. Had *Judas* been the first and only Apostle in his time, his Apostasie and self-murther had been a scandal indelible to the Christian Religion; but it was impossible that such a wickednesse should have fallen out in the first and onely Apostle of Christianity, such a supposition were blasphemous: however *Bolton* being the first Minister of the separation, and the only Minister of it we read of in that time, his Apostasie and self murther is a blot on that way which will stick to it for ever: for can any example be given of any good and gracious way, whereof the first known leader was a confessed self murthering Apostate?

SECT. III.

Concerning Mr. *Brown* and Mr. *Barrow*.

IN the third section, what I spoke of the evill spirit which evidently led Mr. *Brown* all his life, is not denied by Mr. *Cotton*; only he dissents from my calling the Separatists after *Browns* name, because he left that schisme, and returned to the Church of *England*. But my reasons to the contrary he essayes not to answer; I said first, it had been the ancient and common name of that sect since its beginning to this day: and here it may well hold, *Inquietudum cum vulgo*. Secondly, *Brown* was the first man who set up an evident, avowed, and formed separate congregation. Thirdly, he was the first who printed books for that schisme, whence to this day the chief reasons of all who follow the separation are deduced. Mr. *Cotton* answers none of those reasons: and what he brings to the contrary, weighes not much with me. That *Brown* left the way of separation, it did not answer his reasons for separation, nor did his Apostasie remove the stumbling block which his former practice and tenets did lay in the way of these who to this day have broken their neck upon that scandal. The Authour of an errour and schisme, the first inventor of the sophistick reasons, whereupon that errour and schisme ever after hath stand, in all justice may give the name to it, though the man himself do leave that sin, unlesse by leaving of it, he hath so confuted the grounds that he layd before, that none after him do walk in these evill ways which he did invent.

Whether the Separatists be justly styled Brownists.

What I spoke of *Barrow*, Mr. *Cotton* seems to approve it all, but that Queen *Elizabeth* caused him to be hanged on the *Tower-Hill*; he sayes that his execution was at *Tyburn*, and without the Queens knowledge. *Answ.* The execution certainly was done by the Queens officers, and in her name, for the cause mentioned: as for the place, whether it was *Tower-Hill* or *Tyburn*, I shall not question.

SECT. IV.

Of Mr. *Johnson* and Mr. *Ainsworth*.

IN the fourth Section, *Johnson* and *Ainsworth* come to be spoken to: I brought sundrie marks of the displeasure of God, with the way of separation, when these two became

Mr. AINSWORTH *highly extolled by Mr.* COTTON.

became the leaders thereof: the most I brought, Mr. *Cotton* does not gainsay; and what is opposite to any thing I brought, makes little to the question. In that last and greatest schisme of the *Brownists*, whether *Ainsworth* excommunicated *Johnson*, as *Johnson* did *Ainsworth*, it makes nothing to the point of the multitude of schismes in that separate Church, wherein a short time then ever hath been heard of in any humane society. That *Ainsworth* did excommunicate *Johnson* and his company, aswell as *Johnson* did *Ainsworth* and his company, I took it upon the testimony of Mr. *White* in his prophane schisme, who might well have known that matter of fact, himself being a member of that unhappy Church before its last breach: also from Mr. *Pagets Hereseologie*. Mr. *Cotton* is the first I find to contradict this; but herein I will not contend. I am sure *Ainsworths* principles, (to which he uses to cleave as fast as may be) did carry him to excommunicate *Johnson* and his side, when he findes them obstinate in a dangerous error, and insolently injurious therein; even excommunicating all who adhere to the contrary truth and duty: especially when the main point of that question, was the peoples right to excommunicate their Pastor and all their officers for much lesse faults then these whereof *Ainsworth* avowed *Johnson* to be guilty.

What Mr. *Cotton* speakes to the praise of Mr. *Ainsworth*, I did expressly grant to him as fair gifts as to any who yet had appeared in the way of separation. Neither would I willingly contest about the truth of any mans grace or salvation who had any sustainable arguments therefore at the barre of humane charitie: Yet can I not subscribe to witnesse with Mr. *Cotton* the modesty and humility of Mr. *Ainsworths* spirit, who all his life-time was well knowne to have been the head of the most rigid separation, following and recommending the way and writs of that most excessively bitter-spirited man Mr. *Barrow* more then any other; in rigidity going farbeyond his colleague *Johnson* from whom he separated for his relenting but a little, and using in his latter daies in the point of Church government that which Mr. *Cotton* here confesses to have been moderation of spirit. Neither was this the only intemperance of Mr. *Ainsworth*: but when his great friend in that very quarrel with *Johnson* (I mean Mr. *Robinson*) a little thereafter began to relent in his rigidity, and in that branch of separation which concernes Church fellowship, had run back some of his former way towards the reformed Churches, *Ainsworth* for that moderation fell upon him with publick and printed contradictions.

Mr. *Cottons* too much extenuation of Mr. *Ainsworths* evil wayes.

It seemes Mr. *Cotton* here extenuates too fare *Ainsworths* errour, making it but a going astray in the simplicitie of his heart in a point wherein he sought the Lord according to the light revealed to him; he being the man who by his many very corrupt Writs had upholden that dangerous schisme more then any else in his time. And beside all other passages of Gods displeasure against him and of Gods disgracing his way by his particular behaviour therein, may not that be one evidence which we read in Mr. *Pagets errours*, pag. 91? that above five times he had publickly changed his profession, turning first from an English Conformist to a Separatist, and secondly from a Separatist, to a Conformist: thirdly from a Conformist, to a Separatist: fourthly from a Separatist, to a Conformist: fifthly from a Conformist, to a Separatist: yea, sixthly from a Separatist to a new kind of separation: For however he pleads that *Johnson* had turned from their former common principles, yet that last separation which fell in their congregation was not led on by *Johnson*, but *Ainsworth* was the head of it, who peremptorily refused to accept the conditions of-

fered by *Johnſon* for his ſtay with him, even to the ſilencing and keeping quiet of his Judgement in their preſent debates.

The viſibilitie of Gods hand on Ainſworths.

What farther in this ſection Mr. *Cotton* is pleaſed to remarke, that after *Ainſworths* death his company had two elders, *Lachuſe* and *May*, it is not material: what principally I intended, is not queſtioned, the viſibilitie of Gods hand on that congregation which had made ſo much tumultuous noiſe in the world by its laſt rent, the one half with its Paſtor *Johnſon* getting out of *Amſterdam* to *Emdene*, and there evaniſhing to juſt nothing; the other half with its *Doctor Ainſworth* abiding in *Amſterdam*, and after *Ainſworths* death being ſo ſhaken with new diviſions, that for many years they could come to no ſacrament, to no miniſter, to no officer, for labouring in the word.

SECT. V.

Of Mr. *Smith* and Mr. *Robinſon*

Mr. Cottons *great accuracy in examining ſome parts of my booke.*

IT is well that Mr. *Cotton* has nothing to contradict in theſe fearfull paſſages, and that terrible tragedy of *Smyth*, a great Maſter of the ſect in hand, the moſt and worſt whereof I had from the mouth of eminent *Doctor Twiſſe*. As for the place of *Holland* in which that miſerable and exemplary Apoſtate acted his tragedy, whether *Ley* as I was informed, or *Amſterdam*, as Mr. *Cotton*, it makes no farther to the point then this, that Mr. *Cotton* has been ſo carefull as poſſible to inform himſelf of every paſſage of my booke, that where it can be done he may not fail to correct me, were it in the ſmalleſt and moſt inconſiderable circumſtance.

Mr. Cotton *confirmes what I ſay of Mr.* Robinſon.

My obſervations of Mr. *Robinſon* are all rather confirmed by Mr. *Cotton* then in any thing weakned; That for a time he was a prime and cheif leader to the moſt rigid ſeparation, it is not denied, neither can it be, ſo long as his apology and juſtification are viſible. That he fell off at laſt from the one half of that way, Mr. *Cotton* helps me to prove it and more: adding not only his readines to communicate with the *Dutch*, *French*, and *Scottiſh* churches, but alſo his diſclaiming of ſeparation from the church of *England* in its worſt times: and that all he ſtucke at was the common Liturgy, Epiſcopacy, and profaning of the holy table by ignorant and ſcandalous communicants; all which the aſſembly and Parliament at Weſtminſter had ſolemnly removed, and with theſe, all that *Robinſon* ſcrupled for a full communion with the Church of *England* it ſelf.

The independents marvellous variouſnes in rejecting and imbracing ſeparation.

This to me and many more has been oft a matter of griefe and great admiration, what it might be which theſe by-gone yeares has kept them of the congregationall way (contrary to theſe profeſſions of Mr. *Cotton* and all the reſt of his mind whether of new or old *England*) from all reall communion either with the *Engliſh* or any other of the Reformed churches.

Mr. *Robinſon* came to be willing to communicate with the moſt of the reformed churches, yea with the church of *England* it ſelf in many things before its late reformation, and ſo did come back from his rigid ſchiſme to a Semi ſeparatiſme, and as Mr. *Cotton* will have it, to a farr greater nearneſs, yea to a full union and a totall averſneſs from

from all ſeparation, on ſuppoſition of that reformation which M. *Cotton* grants to be now by the grace of God truly performed. Why then do the *Independents* not only ſtand yet (as they profeſſe in their Apology) at *Robinſons* old Semi-ſeparatiſme, but come back to *Ainſworths* full ſeparation, yea runne beyond it (if we may ſo ſpeak) to a ſeſqui-ſeparation, holding up peremptorily a moſt rigid ſeparation from all the Churches of *Brittain* in their practice, what ever they ſpeak in their words and writs, though all that ſtumbled the moſt raſh of the old Separatiſts be fully removed out of the way?

What in the end of this Section is ſpoken of the truth, antiquity, and innocency of Independency without all proof, needs not in this place to be taken in any debate.

SECT. VI.

The Independents contempt of the *Browniſts*.

The only right way of wiping off the Independents the title of Browniſts.

IN the laſt Section of this chapter Mr. *Cotton* does mixe his ink with a little vinegar, to which my reply ſhall be but ſoft. He ſayes it is a walking after the fleſh, it is a ſchiſme and a manifeſt fruit of the fleſh, it is a ſetting of variance among brethren, to nick-name Independents with the name of *Browniſts*, ſince they neither in whole nor part do partake of *Brownes* ſchiſme. *Anſ.* It is no fruit of the fleſh, but a very ordinary and juſt practice of Chriſtians in all ages, to ſtyle erroneous people after the name of the principal Authour of their errors, wherein we have the Holy Ghoſt for a precedent. *Revel. 2. cap. v. 6. 15.*

That the ſingularities of the Independents were invented and ſpread abroad to the world by *Brown*, I have eſſayed to prove by a great multitude of clear teſtimonies in my ſecond and ſix Chapters, to which not a word of reply is yet by any returned. That *Brown* did ſeparate from the Church, and the Independents from the world, I prove the contrary by many teſtimonies: the moſt rigid *Browniſts* profeſſing their ſeparation from no Church at all, but alone from the viſible corruptions of ſome Churches: and the moſt eminent of the *Independents* ſeparating really from all, even the beſt Churches of the world, not of their own way, though clearly purged from all that the *Browniſts* ſtumbled at as corruptions. As for *Browns* return from his evil way, it was his praiſe, not his blame: Is there any reaſon why the followers of his way when it was worſt, ſhould want the infamy of his name, ſince his return did not cure the miſchief which the ſpirit of error did by his tongue and pen begin, and to this day continues, though the man be dead and gone?

I ſhall grant it is an unjuſt and unworthy calumny in all who have imputed any part of *Browniſme* to M. *Cotton* or the Apologiſts, when not by bare denials, but reall deeds they have put off themſelves that aſperſion; and though their by-paſt practiſes I count undefenſible, yet no man ſhall be more glad then I to ſee by future amendments, the grounds of all impurations of that kind wiped clean away.

Whether Independents have written contumeliouſly of the Browniſts *way.*

What I ſpake of the *Independents* contempt of the *Browniſts* way, and of their contumelious ſpeeches thereof, did not import any contempt of their perſons, or that any of their words were not ſpiritual and juſt reproofes, ſo well grounded on Scripture as might be: But my meaning only was, that the *Independents* reproofes were ſuch, as the *Browniſts* could not but take for the greateſt contempts and higheſt contumelies, which any grave adverſaries were

wont to put upon them. This I did prove by M. C. his own words, here altogether untouched and past over, wherein positively he prints the *Brownists* way to be of the devil and not of God, a meer invention of man, neither coming from God nor leading to God, to which none should pray for a blessing, which neither Christ, nor Apostle, nor Prophet ever had delivered, which God had never blessed, either with peace or growth of grace. *Diss. cap.* 3. What will be the sense of any *Brownists* living, of such Elogies from M. C. pen, it is ease to judge.

CHAP. III.

Mr. *Cottons* third Chapter considered touching the Original and Progresse of the Independents in *New-England*.

Mr. COTTONS *great negligence in passing over the most considerable parts of my book.*

MY second Chapter is wholly past over, which yet was of more concernment to have been examined by Mr. *Cotton*, then all that preceded.

My third Chapter consists but of one sheet and a half; upon this alone Mr. *Cotton* does spend the most of all his book that followes, to the number of eleven large sheets. If Mr. *Cotton* might have been at the pains of so prolixe and accurate an examination of all the rest (at least of my first Chapter concerning the Teners and doctrine of the Independents) I would have been glad; however for the paines that are taken, I give thanks, and shall return so good satisfaction as I can, to what principally is objected: if I should passe by many things, Mr. *Cotton* his example will plead my pardon.

SECT. I.

Concerning the Sect of Independents.

IN the first Section I am challenged for calling (albeit with a respectful Preface) the congregational way a *Sect*, and that by the name of Independent. Though this language had not long agoe been prescribed by the continual use of the vulgar, yet for my usurpation of it my whole first Chapter is but a long argument, which as yet lies altogether unanswered.

What here Mr. *Cotton* sayes of their respect to the reformed Churches, takes not off my characterization of their refusall to joyn in government and membership with any Church of the would our of Independent way, so farre as ever I could learne.

What is a schisme.

As for the word Sect, I hope it will be granted that every unjust separation from a true Church, is a reall schisme, and true Sect: and that the schisme (I speak not now of error or heresie) is the worse, the more unjust and causeless it be. If so, (as Mr. *Cotton* or any judicious Divine will not I suppose controvert) then Independency must of all Schismes be the worst, being the most causelesse; yea, so farre without cause, that Mr. *Cotton* in this very place, denies both the causes and effects, as if they were no separation at all, nor any cause for any betwixt the Independents and any reformed Churches.

Concerning

Whether the Congregationals are justly styled Independents.

Concerning the style of Independency, as it was given to the Congregationals by M. *C.* himself, and his own chief friends, *Davenport*, *Hooker*, *Burton*, *Ainsworth*, *Cone*, and many more, and that for divers good reasons, I proved at length in my first Chapter, to which there is not a syllable replyed.

Master *Cotton* his contrary argumentation is not here solid: though Independency were a term straighter then all their tenets, yet if it fitly denotated their principal position, and that which they use to glory in as their great distinctive Tenet, the style for all its strictnesse may well passe current for good and reasonable language.

Independency is the band that knits all Sects together.

As for the largenesse of it, I acknowledge the truth of M. *Cottons* assertion, that the *Anabaptists*, *Antinomians*, *Seekers*, and all the Sects, do avow themselves Independents; this all the world long ago may know to be soo true, that this common principle of Independencie is truly the band that joynes all these Sects in one, which otherwayes are *Multivarious*; yea, as M. *Cotton* tells us, the *Antichrist* of *Rome* is independent. But all this hinders not the term Independent to be fitly enough fixed on them who usually carry it, all the rest going out to many other peculiar by-wayes and tenets, while the Congregationals professe to stand at the point of Independencie alone, and desire to be counted poor Independents, and no more.

That M. *Cotton* will communicate the style of Independencie to the reformed Churches, it is not just; for however one of them depends not upon another, yet all of them professe a subordination to an oecumenick Synod: Neither is an oecumenick Synod Independent, since all their decrees are subject to the trial, correction, and revocation of posterior Assemblies.

Independents are unfitly styled Congregationals.

As for the name which Mr. *Cotton* desires to be put on his way, I will strive with no man for any name he pleases to chuse for distinguishing himself from others: yet against the fit appropriation of a congregation to the Independents, I move these objections.

First, the *Congregation* was the usual title of the Independents chief opposites, the National Church of *Scotland*; for many years after the reformation, it was the usual language there, the *Lords of the Congregation*, the *Members of the Congregation*.

Secondly, why should Independents appropriate to themselves the name of *Congregationall*, since particular congregations in all their just and scriptural rights, are defended by the Churches of *Scotland*, *France*, *Holland*, and others as well as by them?

Thirdly, if they will be *Congregationall*, because they give the whole power of Jurisdiction and censures to every particular congregation, and that to the whole congregation in a supreame Independencie, without all appeales; though this was the way of old *Brownisme*, defended most by *Ainsworth* and *Robinson*, yet the *Brownists* at last have revoked all this, and of Congregational have made their way Presbyterial, putting in the hands of the Presbytery and Eldership, the whole Jurisdiction. In this the Independents have followed *Johnson*, and the late *Brownists* most upon M. *Coton* his motion, translating from the hands of the congregation and fraternity, into the hands of the Eldership, all the power of Authority and acts of Jurisdiction; wherefore the style of Congregationals seems not to be rightly appropriated to them now, who have indeed destroyed the Congregational way, and turned it from Congregational into Presbyterial.

The reformed Churches are unfitly styled classical.

As for the style of Classical which M. *Cotton* would appropriate to all the reformed Churches opposite to Independencie, I object against it, First, The style is new, and of M. *Cotton* his own invention. Secondly, the reformed Churches having four ordinary Ecclesiastick Courts, a Congregational and Classical Presbytery, a Provincial Synod, a National Assembly; what reason they should be styled from one of these, omitting the other three? The Classes ought not to denominate, it being but an inferiour Court, subordinate to superiour Synods and general Assemblies, as supream within the Nation.

SECT. II.

Concerning the number and quality of the *Independents*:

Our Independents in Old England this day are but few, and much fewer then before.

THe second Section speaks to the number and quality of the Independents. Quarrel upon this are little worth; if since the time of my writting, the seed of Independency have much overgrown the land, this fruitfulnes is no argument of its goodnes. Albeit I doubt much, if pure and meer *Independents* in Old-*England* since that day have much increased their number; for of these who then were known for *Independents* only, I doubt if the tenth person do stand this day in that very posture; it is evident that the fartherest pare of such have made so great progresse towards other errors, that the former name of *Independents* may well fall off them, as overshadowed with a new supervenient style.

That the care of the Apologists at the beginning, was to engage alone persons of quality, passing over of purpose multitudes of the meaner rank, the Antapology proves it without any good reply whereof yet I have heard: as for *John Goodwins* labour, I doubt if the Apologists themselves will own it.

Mr. COTTON *excessive in the Independents praises.*

My ascribing the increase of *Independents* to the wisdom of the Apologists, puts no dishonour either on God or man. That the chiefest works of God, even the regeneration of the Elect, the planting of Churches, and watering of them, be ascribed to the instruments, it detracts nothing from God the chief agent, from whom alone is al the increase: how much more may the evill work of propagating *Independencie*, which God alone permits and orders as he does other sinnes, be ascribed to men?

The eminent praises given here to *Independents*, both engagers and engaged, though taken by men to themselves, yet may be questioned by neighbours, whether they be so well deserved, as is here alledged.

SECT. III.

Concerning the *Independents* pedigree in *New-England*.

M. Cotton *mistkens my chief arguments.*

IN the third Section, my deriving *Independency* from *Brownisme* is examined; my first and chief proofs of this by comparing of the particular tenets of the two parties, *Brownists* and *Independents*, whereupon I spend two of the chiefest Chapters of my book, are totally past over: all the rest

reſt I bring, or can be brought to this purpoſe, is not like that probation.

What ever the Congregationals of *New-England* received from Chriſt and the Goſpel, from the Conformiſts, or Non-conformiſts of *England*, was not at all queſtioned: the only debate was about their ſeparation and Independency; theſe they could not receive from Mr. *Bains*; for he and all the other Non-conformiſts of his time were exceedingly oppoſite to theſe wayes: Nor from Mr. *Parker* or Mr. *Ames* who to their dying day were members of the nationall Churches of *Holland*, and of the *Claſſes* and *Synods* there without any known diſſent either from the conſtitution or government of theſe Churches.

My derivation of the ſingularities of *New England* from Mr. *Robinſon* is not well declined: It is not, nor can be denied that they lodged in Mr. *Robinſon* before they were heard of in *New-England*: It is alſo clear that Mr. *Robinſons* diſciples carried theſe tenets with themſelves from *Ley* in *Holland* to *New-Plimmouth* in *America*: theſe things are not denied by Mr. *Cotton*; only he inſinuates that the churches of *New-England* went not in the poynt of ſeparation ſo high as Mr. *Robinſon* or his ſcholars in *New Plimmouth*, a little before Mr. *Robinſon* was made to come ſo near the churches of old *England* as any needed. That Mr. *Cotton* would joyne ſo near with the beſt reformed churches as need were, which here he ſeemes, it ſhould be my joy; but words alone will never ſatisfie, when deeds are to the contrary.

New-England *learned there Independency from Mr.* Rob. *while yet he was a rigid Separatiſt.*

I did ſay that after *Ainſworths* death the churches of the ſeparation were near the expiring, no more appearing after *Johnſons* company had evaniſhed in *Emden*, and *Robinſons* had well neer expired in *Leyden*, but a handfull of the relicts of *Ainſworth* at *Amſterdam*. Againſt this it is ſaid that *Lathrope* had *Jacobs* company then in *Leyden*. *Anſ.* I doubt if *Jacobs* company were Separatiſts, for however their leader had diverſe unſound crotchets, yet the moſt I ever heard imputed to him was but a Semi-ſeparatiſme, and that in a way of his owne, much below Independency, and farr from that of *Robinſons*; however his company was ſo ſmall and unconſiderable, that little acceſſion could come to the Separatiſts by them.

Mr. Jacobs ſemi-ſeparatiſme unconſiderable.

Mr. *Cotton* does at ſome length declare how that part of Mr. *Robinſons* congregation which late downe at *New Plimouth* came not from *Holland* on the ground of diviſion; that diſcourſe contradicts not me: I write expreſly that their going to *America* was on the ground of a more commodious habitation; But that which I ſpoke of the diviſions in Mr. *Robinſons* flock after the departure of theſe of *New-Plimmouth* from *Holland*, is totally miſkend. When Mr. *Robinſon* had left his former principles, as it ſeemes he did after the tranſmigration of a part of his followers *Anno* 20. when his old friend *Ainſworth* and he were yoaked in writing one againſt another, was there no ſtirr among his flock upon this his change? if ſo, how then comes it, that quickly thereafter all that company which abode at *Leyden* diſſolved and came to nothing? Much of the Separatiſts hiſtory is yet in the darke and in priſon, it were good that all were brought to the light and the free air.

I had ſaid, That the firſt church of new *England* was that of *New-Plimmouth*, and that they had continued in the way of ſeparation which they had learned from Mr. *Robinſon* in his worſt times, and that the other churches of *New England* had borrowed from them the ſame wayes of Mr. *Robinſon*: about theſe matters of fact Mr. *Cotton* has ſome diſcourſe, but ſuch as does not much croſſe my narration: Be it ſo that the church of *New Plimmouth* was divers yeares without any vicinitie; does this

hinder

hinder that inconcinent it levened all the vicinitie, if ſo that all the neighbours ſo ſoone as they came to ſit downe beſide them did take up from them their way? Be it ſo that the planters in *New England*, Miniſters and people were of ſo gracious and wiſe a ſpirit as not to be led by any but God in his holy word, does this hinder them to make uſe of the miniſtery and ſervice of the men of *New-Plimmouth* whome they were perſwaded did follow the Lord in his holy ſcripture, in all theſe things which they borrowed from them? The queſtion here is only of fact, whether the churches of *New England* did learne their way from that part of *Mr. Robinſons* congregation, whom they found at *New-Plimmouth*: I proved they did by three teſtimonies, to which Mr. *Cotton* does anſwer nothing at all. Though Mr. *Edwards* and Mr. *Rathband* had been paſt by, yet Mr. *Cotton* his owne formal teſtimony ſhould not have been neglected; Mr. *Weld* who profeſſes his certaine knowledge of theſe matters of fact in *New-England*, in his accurate examination of all Mr. *Rathbands* relations, offers no contradiction at all to this his aſſertion, that from the pattern of *New-Plimmouth* the reſt of *New England* had taken their Church diſcipline, and that by way of direct conſultation and advice.

SECT. IV.

Of Mr. *Cottons* diſlike and liking of the *New-Engliſh* way.

Mr. Cotton *does not well clear himſelf of unconſtancy.*

I ſaid Mr. *Cotton* was the firſt divine who appeared in contradiction of the *New-Engliſh* way: I proved what I ſaid by his owne letters to Mr. *Skelton*, he anſwers that the errour he reproved in Mr. *Skelton* was his denyall that the congregations of old *England* were particular reformed Churches: and that in this reproofe many were before him, and that herein he did remaine conſtant without any change. To this I reply firſt, that the paſſage I cite makes it manifeſt that Mr. *Cotton* reproves not only that errour but the way it ſelf of the Church of *Salem* the ſecond congregation of *New-England* erected in the yeare 1628, wherewith the churches of *Boſtone*, *Waterton*, *Roxburry* and *Doceſter* had joyned, declaring the fountaine not only of that errour but of their new way which he reproves, to have been the Separatiſts at *New-Plimmouth*. That Mr. *Cotton* does marke both the Maſters and ſchollers of this errour and new way, the words of his letter make it plaine.

Secondly. That he was the firſt that noted the Separatiſts of errour, was not affirmed by me, but that he was the firſt of all others who did obſerve and write againſt the errours of the Separatiſts among the planters of *New England* both in their firſt Church at *Plimmouth*, and in their ſecond at *Salem*, with whom he ſayes the reſt did agree.

Mr. Cottons *true interfering as I conceive.*

Thirdly, we deſire from our heart it were moſt true what Mr. *Cotton* affirmes in his owne name and in the name of the body of the churches of *New-England*, that they according to their principles doe hold the congregations of old *England* for particular reformed churches: But withall we earneſtly deſire this people may be anſwered which makes our beleif of this point truly doubtſome: whom Mr. *Cotton* and the churches of *New-England* account particular reformed churches, from theſe they doe not ſeparate, they doe not require their diſſolution, they can live with them with a ſafe conſcience as officers and members. But ſo it is that Mr. *Cotton* and theſe of the

Churches

Churches of *New-England* count it necessary to separate from the Churches of old *England*, they presse their dissolution, they will not live either as officers or members in any of them. As I take it, Mr. *Cotten* his Church at old *Boſtone* was one of the beſt ordered congregations of old *England*; yet Mr. *Cotton* thought it fit, as here he profeſſes, to ſegregate ſome ſcore of Godly perſons in it from the reſt, and to joyn them in a covenant among themſelves: This no meer unconformiſts had ever done. Can this be any thing leſs then ſeparation, at leaſt in ſome ſenſible degree, whether never any meer unconformiſts had come?

Vide *Poſtſcript.*

Farther, did ever Mr. *Cotton* or any of the Churches of *New England* conſent that any part of any old *Engliſh* congregation ſhould ſit downe beſide them in *New England* without diſſolution from their old Church ſtate and Church membership, re-entering in a new Church-Conſtitution after the way of *New England*? does not the anſwer to the 33 queſtions make this clear? does not the late act of the court at *Boſtone* make ſuch a motion as this, a high and ſeditious crime? yet Mr. *Cotton* in this very ſection does tell us of a part of Mr. *Robinſons* Separatiſtick congregation ſitting downe at *New Plimouth* without any change to that day deſired by any in *New England* of the Church ſtate they had at *Ley* under Mr. *Robinſons* miniſtery in the time of his moſt rigid Separation.

Laſtly, as we have ſaid before, we cannot learn that any of Mr. *Cottons* or *New-Englands* way have ever been willing to ſerve either as officers or live as members in any congregation of old *England*; But their labour alwayes has been to this day to erect where they were able new congregations, and to diſſolve the old; for a new gathering according as Mr *White* againſt Mr. *Prin* avowes, had been the practiſe in the Summer Ilands, after the pattern and expreſſe advice they had received from *New-England*. How theſe and the like practiſes can conſiſt with what Mr. *Cotton* affirmes to be his owne judgement and of the body of the Churches of *New England*, I confeſſe I cannot underſtand but ſhall be glad to learne it.

Mr. Cotton declares himſelfe more for ſeparation then I alledged I while yet in England.

I had ſaid of Mr. *Cotton* as truly I conceived for his commendation, that while he ſtayed in old *England* he had gone no further then *Cartwright*, and the preabyterian Non conformiſts; though he was unſatisfied with epiſcopacy, and had left off ſome of the ceremonies, yet that he was free of the Separatiſts I proved by his owne letters both againſt the rigid Separation, and the ſofter alſo of the *Robinſonians* at *New-Plimmouth*. For this a long and ſharpe enough quarrel is made. To which I anſwer firſt. That my innocent and ordinary Metaphore of diſtaſte for diſaffection and diſſent needed not at all to have been carped at.

Secondly, The ceremonyes I meant wherein Mr *Cotton* continued, were the read liturgy in the publique prayers and Sacraments, which I proved he never gave over while in old *England*, out of his owne letters from *New-England*. If the liturgy it ſelfe without the croſſe or kneeling or holy-dayes and other ſignificant rites may not well go under the name of a ceremony, and that a long and a great one, I ſhall be loth to conteſt, it being but for words.

Thirdly, That Mr *Cotton* while in old *England*, did mind any thing beyond Non-conformity, I did not know while now he tells me; for I had thought his Declaration againſt all Separatiſts both whole and half, had given me good ground to ſpeak ſo much of his mind: yet while he declares, that even then he was for more then I beleeved, I ſhall take it ſo, but with theſe obſervations.

On this side. 1. That Church-state beyond Presbyterian Non-conformity, and against not only the *Robinsonian* Separatisme of *New Plimuth*, but even against the way of M. *Skelton* at *Salem*, and of the rest in *New England*, was a real mystery above the reach of a far quicker man then I, before it was revealed.

2. M. *Parker* and M. *Ames*, who lived and died members of the Classes in *Holland*, and allowed well of the Jurisdictional Assembly at *Dort*, in deposing the Remonstrant Ministers, could never lead M. *Cotton* nor any other into the way of Independency, contrary to their own constant practice to their death.

3. M. *Cottons* censure of my conviction from my own words of the running over of my tongue and pen in the heat of my pursuit, of the interfering of one of my words with another, seems not to be so well grounded a censure, for what ever interfering seems to be in my words, M. *Cotton* is obliged to explicate it, because it is nought but the conjunction of his words with his deeds; his writing to M. *Skelton* against the way of the Churches of *New England*, and his going out of *England* to joyn with these Churches. These letters M. *Cotton* does not deny to be his, nor can that action be denied to be his: if any contradiction appear, it will be found betwixt M. *Cotton* his words and his deeds, not in my laying of them together; yet if M. *Cotton* please, the contradiction may easily be loosed: M. *Cotton* when in old *England*, reproves the way of *Plimuth* and *Salem*, and possibly of all the rest there; yet he went out of *England* to joyn with these Churches, but not to joyn in these errors he reproved in them. Had God been pleased to have made M. *Cotton* constant in that which I beleeved had been his judgement in old *England*, how easie a work, by Gods blessing, had it been for him and the brethren who went over with him, to have brought all the Churches from *Robinsons* error to the way of the Non-conformists in *England*, and of the reformed elsewhere? or if that had not been so easie, yet a liberty seems then most easily attainable by M. *Cotton*, to have kept his Presbyterian principles; this difference might well have stood with his joyning in other things with the *American* Churches. I do not speak of M. *Cotton* and the rest of his brethren joyning with the *Brownists* there, in acts of most hearty communion, notwithstanding of some avowed differences: But I know M. *Blair* and our *Scottish* Brethren, who went with him half way to *America*, a little after M. *Cotton* his going thither, notwithstanding all their purpose of joyning with these Churches of *New-England*, yet were very far from all intention to have quit any of the *Scottish* Presbyterian principles.

SECT. V.

How *Independency* became dangerous, after it had gotten Mr *Cotton* for its Patron.

Mr. Cottons needles and undue praises of Independency.

I Had said that *Independency* became dangerous to the world, after M. *Cottons* embracing thereof: my meaning of this phrase *I* made very plain, by the reason *I* subjoyned to it. The eminency of M. *Cottons* gifts, whereby he made Independency to be favoured by many both in New and Old *England*, who never before had taken notice of it. M. *Cotton* from these my words takes occasion when none at all was given, to run out on the great praises of the Independents and their way, and the great blessings they brought to all kinds of worlds, to the Pagan world, to the Christian world, to the Antichristian world; this digression needed not.

What

What good the Pagans in *America* have gotten from their *English* neighbours either in soul or body, I will not essay to diminish; and whatever blessing God hath bestowed on the labours of Mr. *Eliot* and others for converting of poor Pagans, my heart rejoyces for it: but these fruits are ill placed on the back of *Independency*. I have shewn in my *Disswasive*, that *Independency* hath been the great impediment of the Gospels prospering among the Pagans; and the great cause why that work hath been undertaken so exceeding lately by the *English*, notwithstanding of the fair opportunities which the Lord had put in their hands, of advancing long agoe that very excellent service.

For the Antichristian world, whatever fear they may have of the new *English* planters, yet of their *Independency* they have no fear at all: but the confusion and weaknesse that naturally hangs on it, is the great ground of their hope, and quieting of all their fears from the *English*, who without this disease might indeed long since have been terrible to their Catholick cause.

Mr. COTTONS *improbable reasoning.* That the ruine of Episcopacy was performed by the Independents, even by the turning of their backs, and flying away some thousand miles from that adversary, being never visible in that combat, till after the Presbyterians by the losse of much precious blood had given the dead stroak, the next generation may believe it, but these which have seen with their eyes matters as they passed, will not be in great danger of such an error.

That Independency only by accident, and not of its own nature, hath opened a wide gap to Sects and errors, and that it hath been but an accidental occasion, and no true cause of keeping the Churches of *England* to this day unsettled, after all the pregnant opportunities have been offered to them by God of a settled reformation; and that first the retarding, and then the total frustrating of the oft promised reformation, is to be taken off the Independents, and charged upon the back of the Presbyterians, whether *Scots* or *English*, if M. *Cotton* and I both would endeavour to perswade, our labour in this by the most of men would but be pitied or laughed at. We know who went to perswade the blacknesse of the snow, and whitenesse of the Raven, the heat of the Ice, and cold of the fire, the standing of the sunne, and swift motion of the earth: but without great speed with men, who had their common sense remaining uncorrupt.

SECT. VI.

How Mr. *Cotton* was the mis-leader of Mr. *Davenport*, and Mr. *Goodwin*.

M. COTTONS *clear mistake.* THere is more carping at words, tartnesse, and clear mistaking in this and the next Section, then I would have expected from M. *Cottons* pen. In my margine I had spoken of Mr. *Cotton* his misleading of Mr. *Davenport* and Mr. *Goodwin*: In my Text I shew that this was done by his letters from *New-England*; by way of introduction I spoke of M. *Cotton* his first dealing with them in his *London* conference, whereby he brought them off their *English* conformity. If M. *Cotton* did think that I called this service a mis-leading, he indeed mistakes me, for *English* conformity to me is an errour and sin; the bringing from it is a leading to truth, and a commendable labour; but all the mis-leading I meant and clearly exprest in the place, was by the means of his letters from *England*, even a perswasion to Independency.

It is no dishonour to the great and principall guider of soules, to have very weak men his instruments in the acts of his leading, nor is it any disparagement to the greatest spirits to be led, as by God, so by his servants. It is no overvaluing of M. *Cotton*, nor undervaluing of M. *Davenport* and M. *Goodwin*, to make him their leader, as he professes they in many things have been his: but all the question is of the misleading, *If* M. *Cotton* could pardon me my judgement that Independency is a reall error, he would not deny but all leading towards it were a true misleading.

SECT. VII.

Of Mr. *Cottons* sudden change to *Independency*, and Mr. *Goodwin's* following him therein.

Mr. COTTONS *unreasonable tartnesse.*

MAster *Cotton* his censure of my words, as far from truth, yea from ingenuity, is so sharp, that it ought to have been well grounded: All that is challenged in my words, *I* did prove to be absolutely true under M. *Cottons* own hand, without any sufficient reply: *I* hope the phrase is good, innocent, and of a very reasonable construction, when a man is said to do so soon as he tastes of the aire of a place, what he does at his first comming thither. But so it is, that the very first letter M. *Cotton* writes from *New England* to his friends at *Bolstone*, is to separate from the congregation there, not from their errors alone, but even from their Sacraments and publick prayers, which he acknowledges himself had never done; this was all the matter of my words.

I called the way of the Churches of *New-England* the Religion of *New-England*. Is this so great a crime that my judiciousness must needs be reflected upon for it, as before my ingenuity and truth? I hope Mr. *Cotton* will be loth to joyne with those divines who take it in ill part to have Christian religion subdivided in any species; who lately in *England* went to make great divine, that Lutheranisme, Arminianisme, Anabaptisme, yea, that Popery it self and Protestantisme, should be called divers religions. Leaving such disputes now, it is enough to me that the phrase is currant, and ordinary enough to count every eminent division, were it but among Monks of a diverse order, a different religion, much more these nationall more large and divisive differences, of what ever importance, the matter may be greater or smaller.

A. for a passionate affection, as it is any more in common language or any good reason, then an affection in a high degree? does it at all denominate the subject a passionate man, much lesse a man subject to any inordinate affection? These conclusions are M. *Cottons* deductions, but have nought to do with my words.

The next quarrel for the sense of the word *Convert*, is of so small an allay, that I had rather grant what here is desired, then to keep up so poor a debate; albeit I beleeve the use of the word in my sense be common enough in ordinary discourse, and used by M. *Cotton* himself in the same Treatise, before he close, offer then once.

What I spoke of M. *Goodwin* his coming off with very little adoe from disconformity to Independency, does not exclude many prayers, sighs and groanes, but many visible means whereof he world could take notice; for the time betwixt his first disconformity and open avowing of Independency was so short, and any visible means of that change so small that ever I heard of, or which M. *Cotton* when put to it, does here mention, that it seems this second change was made without much adoe, and

with

with far leſſe then many men have uſed in far leſſe changes.

I did not call nor account M. *Goodwin* either a bold or a boaſting man, though ſuch bold and boaſting words did fall from him. That the words were no better then I called them, M. *Cotton* does not deny: and that they were Mr. *Goodwins*. I proved it by one famous enough witneſſe; who albeit not in a Court of Judicatory, yet for all the uſe I made of him, may ſtand for many: The man being moſt honeſt and faithful, and witneſſing what he ſpake in the face of the party, before the High Court of Parliament, without the contradiction to this day, of any whom it concerned.

That *Edwards* Antipology four whole yeares after its printing at *London*, ſhould not come to *New England*, and to M. *Cottons* hand, to me is a marvel, the intercourſe being ſo frequent, and the matter of that book concerning them, and their wayes ſo nearly.

M. *Edwards* next teſtimony ſo circumſtantial as I ſaid, will not with many men go for *Apocrypha*: however M. *Cotton* defends much of the matter it ſelf, but with ſuch arguments as if I had uſed them, belike I might have heard both of my truth, and of my ingenuity. Will M. *Cotton* ſay that M. *Cartwrights* diſcipline was the very ſame for ſubſtance with that of *New England* and the Independents? Or if this had been true, the Independents and Presbyterians had not found their accommodation ſo long impoſſible. It is my grief that M. *Cotton* in his concluſion is evidently miſtaken; nor could it well be otherwayes, the arguments whereupon he bindes it, are ſo unſufficient.

Mr. COTTON *is now farre from the way of* Cartwright.

M. *Cartwright* would not have drunkards, whoremongers, or any ſcandalous perſon kept in the Church, this indeed is a Presbyterian principle. But require the Independents no more for the matter of their Churches? if this be truly M. *Cottons* mind, it was a thouſand pities, but as ſundry of us at that time did wiſh he had been ſent for from *New England* to the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*. Sure I am, if he could have perſwaded the diſſenting brethren to have reſted content with that much for the matter of congregations, we and they had agreed our ſar greateſt controverſie, without more debate. But we find it far otherwayes; to this day we ſee no other in our brethren, but that their principles and practice do require the real diſſolution of all, even the beſt reformed Churches of the Presbyterian frame, and a new gathering of Churches, made up of perſons not only of the fulleſt profeſſion, void of ignorance and all ſcandal, but alſo ſo viſibly Saints, that they be able to give not only to the officers, but the body of the people whom they are to live with in Church fellowſhip, ſatisfactory marks of their true grace and actual regeneration. Will M. *Cotton* ſay that *Cartwright* or any of the old Non-conformiſts, did ever lay ſo fundamental a ſtone of *Brownisme*?

His ſecond reaſon is, that *Cartwright* makes uſe of the Apoſtles reproof of the *Corinthians* for not excommunicating the inceſtuous perſon. Will M. *Cotton* conclude hence, that *Cartwright* was in the Independents mind in theſe their principal aſſertions? 1. That the Church of *Corinth* for all its multitude both of members and officers, was no more then a Congregational Church meeting in one private room for all their holy performances, as well of Sacraments and diſcipline, as of the word. Secondly, that the exerciſe of the higheſt juriſdiction was in the hands of the body of the people, and not of the Officers. Thirdly, that the Soveraign and Independent power of all juriſdiction, was ſo in the hand of the people in every congregation, that in the groſſeſt aberrations, moſt ſolemn and pure Aſſemblies had no right to execute the leaſt part of any juriſdiction, of any cenſure at all upon any the moſt ſcandalous and

erroneous member of any particular flock. It will trouble M. *Cotton* to prove the truth of these Propositions in themselves; but to prove M. *Cartwrights*, or any old Non-conformists belief of them, will be of a much harder task.

What I brought from M. *Williams*, was only to clear and make probable the meaning of that question of M *Edwards* concerning *Goodwin*, otherwayes the words themselves were clear enough, either of M. *Cotton*, or of his eminent friends in *New-England*. I know well the extream mistakes of *Williams* in the fundamentals of Church Ordinances: for all that, I would be loth in any point of fact, to call his testimony in question without a great cause, as here I know none; for the very ordinary thoughts and speeches of many now adayes are, that their own societies are much more pure from errors and scandals, then were the Churches of *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Ephesus*, or any other known in the Apostles dayes.

SECT. VIII.

Of Mr. *Cotton* his frequent changes.

MY high, I will not say over-valuation of M. *Cotton*, and my conception of his great influence in the state of *England*, and of new *English* principles in the affaires of *Britain*, did make me speak of M. *Coston* his changes, with reference to the weal and woe of the whole Isle: in this I apprehend nor to this day any great misconception.

The change I spoke of M. *Cotton*, my words immediately preceding, make manifest to have been his going over from the Non-conformists to the Independents; the giving over of *English* conformity, and doing all which the Parliament according to the advice of the Assembly, did reform in old *England*, was never noted by me as a fault; but I hope neither the Assembly nor Parliament did ever command or allow of the way of the new *English* Churches. How great an opinion soever I had of M. *Cottons* sufficiency in the art of reasoning, yet did I never think him or any man able to prove that the Parliament and Assembly, and my self also, are all turned to M. *Cottons* Independency, and though M. *Cotton* should offer to reason me to such an incredible belief, yet should I not believe it.

What here is anticipate of M. *Cottons* Pelagianisme, I shall take it upon in its own place; and what is repeated of casting the new *English* air, was spoken to in the former Section: Only M. *Cotton* might have remembred that the date of his letter to *Bolston* here spoken of was mis-printed, 35. standing for 33. for the matter of that letter shewes it was with the very first he wrote from *New-England*, in the same year he came thither, and could not be two or three years thereafter.

SECT. IX.

In what causes the Saints failings are to be discovered.

MAster *Cotton* here takes a course to have all the failings of the Saints so bound, that none of them for any end may for ever be more remembred; but this is clean contrary to the course of the holy Ghost in Scripture, where the Saints do register both their own failings, and those of others: *Moses* hangs up before the Sun his

his own misbelief, the idolatry of his brother *Aaron* the Saint of God, the murther of his father *Levi*, the envy of his sister *Miriam*. *Paul proclaimes* his own persecutions and *Peters* unstableness: was this to make the vessels of honour vessels of disgrace? was this to overthrow the Councel of God? does our obligation to cover the uncomely members of Christ, hinder us to speak in any case of the blemishes of the most comely members in his body? why should M. *Cotton* throw the holy Scriptures to such by-senses?

I proponed one case, wherein I thought it not only lawful, but expedient to mark the failings of the godly; to wit, when their graces were inolved, and made snares and stumbling blocks to mis-lead simple ones to their errors: this M. *Cotton* makes to do evill that good may come of it, to sin for a good end. But why does he not first prove that *Moses*, *John* and *Paul*, did sin in registrin their own and others failings? what he brings of the supposite and imaginary causes of *Paul Barnabas*, and *Peter*, proves that it is not ever and at all occasions seasonable to remember the sins of the godly; But follows it hence that it is never lawful to remember them? especially in the pregnant case I brought most of all: If you adde to it M. *Cottons* present condition, obstinacy, and peremptory denial of the sinnes charged upon him; If any thing either in divine or humane justice keep the Saints blots unburied, it is their pertinacy to defend them, as M. *Cotton* here openly does, rejecting all, as either no sins, or none of his.

SECT. X.

Of Mr. *Cotton* his Prelaticall Tenets.

Mr. Cotton shews here no greif for his prelaticall errours.

I had remembred Mr. *Cotton* of his long continuance in the errours of his education, of his approbation of Episcopacy and the rest of conformity till the time he left it, the best men I have been acquainted with, have ever been willing upon any occasion to acknowledge and to professe grief for their failes in this kinde: What Mr. *Cotton* may mean I know not, while at this my *memento* he is so farre from any acknowledgment or sorrow, that all his reply is spent in nothing but a bitter charging of me with unconsideration, yea transportation of mind, forgetting my self, of running into contradictions in my very next page. If these challenges be just, and if his *Dilemma* have any hornes at all, himselfe be judge. I count his continuance in Episcopall errours and conformity a sinne: I count his running over from hence to Independency another sinne: is there here any contradiction? there is betwixt these two sinfull practices in the two extreames (at least in my knowen judgement) a golden mediocrity. I never challenged it for any errour in Mr. *Cotton* that he left the Prelates and Ceremonies, but that he stuck so unto them: This *terminus à quo* of his motion, his leaving of Prelaticall errours, I counted it his duty: all the unhappinesse I spoke of was *in termino ad quem*, that his progresse rested not with the old Conformists, in the Presbytry of the reformed Churches, but ranne beyond this to the Independency of the Separatists: This to me was but to move from one errour to another, from the lime pit to the coal-heugh.

SECT.

SECT. XI.

Of Mr. *Cotton* his Pelagianiſme.

Dr. Twiſſe layes Pelagianiſme in the higheſt degree, yea Vorſtaniſme to Mr. Cot. charge whereof yet he hath not cleared himſelf.

I did not condemne **M. Cotton** either for a Pelagian or an Arminian, but I ſaid he had faln into Pelagian and Arminian errours, & had ſwimmed for a time in that gulfe. I thought indeed that he had left theſe tenets, and ſo Dr. *Twiſſe* was by Mr. *Simpſon* informed, as he ſayes in his preface to his booke lately printed againſt Mr. *Cotton*. But I ſee Mr. *Cotton* denyes that he is yet in any thing changed from his former opinions, and that Dr. *Twiſſe* his great labour upon him as yet hath had but little fruit.

The good opinion that the Doctor had of his perſon and intentions I did not contradict, but ſpoke only of his tenets wherein Dr. *Twiſſe* goes beyond me very farr in rigidity of cenſure; he calles M *Cottons* tenets alſo expreſſe Arminianiſme as ever Arminius or Corvinus did write. p. 69. p. 242. The gulf of Arminianiſme and Pelagianiſme is Dr. *Twiſſe* his Phraſeologie. p. 145. p 210. p. 48. Neither is that a meer generalitie, but he charges the moſt of Arminius and Pelagius particular errours on M. *Cottons* words, as the direct overturning of the doctrine of election. p. 94. p. 123. p. 143. Alſo in the preface, the univerſalitie of grace. p 116. the power of nature in the unregenerate to reject. p. 208. p 115. and to believe. p. 89 p. 92. p. 109. p. 235. the ſalvation of Pagane and *Turkiſh* infants. p. 287. yea of diverſe among them of riper years without Chriſt by the covenant of workes. p 116. p. 270. Neither thus farr alone does M. *Cottons* treatiſe goe (if D. *Twiſſe* ſlumber him not) but to the higheſt degree of Vorſtian Socinianiſme, to the overthrow of the divine nature, of the attribute of Omnipotency. p. 77. p. 103. Unchangeablneſs p 106. Omniſcience. p. 249. Soveraign tie. p 100 yea to the encroaching upon the Trinitie of the divine perſons. p. 115. Theſe terrible tenets Mr. *Cotton* does not maintaine expreſſly, but as Dr. *Twiſſe* ſpeaks in a diſſimulate and prevaricating way, yet with ſo much clearneſs as did much trouble the godly, making their hearts to bleed. p 235. and confirming the erroneous p. 234. p 104. p. 209. p. 68. and making the Arminians to boaſt. p. 134. That M *Cotton* affects a ſingularitie. p. 129. p. 229. that he is a thrower off of ſcripture. p. 200 that his writing is fraughted with foule untruths. p. 27. Dr. *Twiſſe* in the named treatiſe declares his conſtant and remaining judgement of Mr. *Cotton* & his writs ſo farr as I have ſaid and farther, as any who pleaſes to read will ſee, That Mr. *Cotton* ſhould have lyen under for ſo many years ſo heavy charges, and to this day never aſſayed to give any anſwer, who ſhall not marvell?

SECT. XII.

Of Mr. *Cottons* his *Montaniſme*.

I Had given a very ſhort touch in two lines only of any old imputation of Montaniſme upon Mr. *Cotton*; hereupon two large leafs are ſpent and cloſed up with a cenſure

cenſure quick enough that my ſpeech ſavoured neither of truth nor love, nor wiſdome, nor faithfulneſſe. All which I ſaid here, was oft told me by a very reverent able and gracious divine, one of the aſſembly, a Miniſter at *London* Mr *P* to wit, that a ſuſpition of Montaniſme lay on Mr. *Cotton* while yet but a young man in the Univerſitie of *Cambridge*.

I ſhould truly be glad that Mr. *Cotton* might rub off all which of that or any other kind of errour was ever aſcribed to him by any; but I fear this ſhall not be done without the remainder of ſome ſcarr and blemiſh, if farther clearing be not brought then what here appears.

From *Auguſtine* and *Daneus* the tenets of *Montanus* are truly ſet downe; yet *Euſebius*, *Epiphanius*, and *Theodoret* doe adde ſome more for our preſent purpoſe.

That Phrygian pepuſite had gotten the beginning of his way from the heretick indeed, yet otherwayes very learned and excellent man, *Tatian* the *Encratite*; ſo ſoone as he had drunken in his errour, he became ſingularly rigid, and in ſhew to the world extraordinarily pious, and chaſt even to the condemnation of marriage, and abſtinent from all fleſh, all wine in the very *Euchariſt*, putting water in its place. This at once took with whole regions of people and ſome moſt eminent Doctors of the Church: good *Tertullian* was at laſt entangled both in this errour and ſchiſme. They behoved to be the only ſpiritual men, the reſt in the Catholique Church were ſo carnall that it was neceſſary to ſeparate from them.

The clear Montaniſme of the Independents.

This branche of Montaniſme let Mr. *Cotton* be as free of it as is poſſible, yet he will not deny that almoſt his flock for a long time were peſtered with it, making themſelves the ſpiritual and gracious partie, and all their oppoſites, even all the miniſters of *New-England* except two, to be carnal, ungracious and ſpiritleſs; avowing Mr. *Cotton* to be the head, father; and patrone of this ſpice of clear Montaniſme: and though with much adoe & din Mr. *Cotton* got theſe aſperſions rubbed of, yet to this day has no ſolid courſe been taken to put away the moſt cauſleſs ſchiſme to the Churches of *New-England* and the *Independents* elſewhere, among whom all know Mr. *Cotton* to ſtand the whole head and ſhoulders above all others.

Notwithſtanding of all that yet is written and ſaid, is not this the generall practiſe of all in Mr. *Cottons* way, that the conſtitution of all other reformed Churches, is to them ſo unholy and full of mixture, that without a diſſolution, without a new gathering and a new erection, their conſcience would be defiled to joyne either as officers or members in the beſt of them? Is not this groſſe enough Montaniſme? O if Mr. *Cotton* and every other of the congregationall divines would be pleaſed in deed (not in words) ſo to joyne with the reſt of the reformed Churches, that their ſeparation might no longer continue in the eyes of all beholders.

The groſſeſt Montaniſme flouriſhed very long in Mr. Cottons flock.

Secondly, The groſſeſt errour of *Montanus*, the very character of his heretie was, that after his dreames of his owne and his parties more then ordinary ſpiritualneſſe, he conceived the very perſon of the holy Ghoſt to dwell perſonally in himſelf and all his followers, and ſo to act all their ſpiritual workes, that the faculties of their ſoules did act none of them; but that the holy ghoſt immediatly without all cooperation of their ſpirit did all their workes; yea that themſelves and the holy ghoſt were perſonally one, ſo that *Montanus* called himſelf the holy ghoſt, and all his ſpeeches and doctrines reall oracles and revelations no leſſe firm and ſure then what the holy ghoſt had ſpoken by any of the Prophets or Apoſtles in the written word; all this behoved to be taken for the doctrine of the goſ-

pel and free-grace; who imbraced it were ſpiritual and gracious; who rejected it were but of the world, fleſhly and ungracious. Let Mr. *Cotton* be alſo uncapable of ſuch abominations as poſſible; yet who would not have ſtumbled to ſee all theſe tares ſpring up round about him and grow ſo long in his charge without any oppoſition from him, that not one, two, or three, but very many did affirme them to be the reall fruits of his miniſtry and labour?

The perſonal inhabitation of the ſpirt was the very Character and great roote of Montaniſme.

It was needleſſe here for Mr. *Cotton* to prove the inhabitation of the perſon of the ſpirit in the ſouls of all beleivers; for the inhabitation of all the three perſons of the trinity in all the members of Chriſt was never to my knowledge queſtioned by any. But the errour of *Montanus* which we are told in the ſhort ſtory to have ſpoiled *Boſton*, was the perſonall inhabitation of the ſpirit; the very character, the head and worſt errour of that old heretique, to which the reſt about revelations and laying aſide ſanctification as legal, and union with Chriſt by acts of the ſpirit alone before and without any operation of faith or any grace inherent in us, were but conſequential appendices and ſmall branches from that great roote.

In whoſe hearts would not thoughts have riſen when Mr. *Wheelwright* in Mr. *Cottons* pulpit and hearing did drive theſe conceits publiquely ſo high, as to enveigh againſt all diſſenters therefrom both Magiſtrates, Miniſters and people, as enemies of Jeſus Chriſt, and true Antichriſts: exhorting thoſe of his mind to act againſt the other in many words, which imported no leſſe then tumults and killing? was it time here for M. *Cotton* to have been ſilent? yea, when the Magiſtrates for ſaving of their own throats, and of the whole people of the land, whom they conceived to be in a viſible danger of a Monaſterian Tragedy, had paſt but a very modeſt ſentence againſt *Wheelwrights* moſt dangerous ſedition: when all the reſt of the miniſters of the land then at *Boſtone* had declared themſelves againſt that man, why did *M. Cotton* alone differ from all the reſt in theſe proceedings?

Thirdly, when at the Synod the miniſters thought it neceſſary to have *M. Cottons* Sermons and diſcourſes on theſe words tried, and for that end had drawne ſome interrogatories; how comes it that in ſo many of his anſwers, he ſpeaks of a union with Chriſt even to actual juſtification, without any act of faith at all, ſo as the brethren of the Synod did ſeem not to be ſatisfied according to *M. Cottons* own relation? was it not then more then time that all reliſhes, all beginnings, all the ſmalleſt appearances of that dangerous *Montaniſme* ſhould have been fully extirpate and caſt over the hedge?

Fourthly, I point but at one other circumſtance of *Montaniſme*, very viſible in *M. Cottons* flock of old, that hereſie for its great propagation had a chief and noted inſtrument, the Propheteſſe *Maximilla*, who after large boaſting of her revelations and ſpirit of prophecy, having ſeduced very many ſimple people, at laſt had a curſed end by her own hands. Juſt ſo at the renovation of *Montaniſme* in *Boſtone*, that hereſie for its great and prime propagatrix had Miſtreſſe *Hutcheſon*, a great boaſter of her revelations; who after her long ſeduction of many, though not by her own hands, yet by her own unreaſonable wilfulneſſe and perverſe folly, did miſerably periſh.

SECT.

SECT. XIII.

Of Mr. *Cotton* his *Antinomy* and *Familisme*.

IN this second Section are spent twenty long pages in a very accurate and elaborate refutation of no more then one of mine.

We need no contest for the preferrence in absurdity and danger, betwixt old *Montanisme* and the new *Familisme* of *Bostone*: The worst of old *Montanisme*, a personal union with the spirit was there maintained. Neither did *Cortyne* go beyond the abominations which the short story layes to Mistresse *Hutchesons* charge. The grounds whereupon I laid some of her errors on M. *Cotton*, are not (as it seems to me) by all his labour yet satisfactorily removed.

The presumptions of Mr. COTTONS *errours not yet well cleared.*

I began with the womans own testimony; It is replied that *Wightman* the *Montanist* said as much of *Hildersham*, as she did of M. *Cotton*. But I added, it was not she alone who said this of M. *Cotton*, but many more with her avowed the same. To this it is replied; when they were poled by M. *Cotton* himself, they did deny all such assertions. I rejoyned, that the short story avowed after these denials, in the face of the general Court, in the hearing of M. *Cotton* himself and many more Ministers, these evil reports of M. *Cotton* were over and over distinctly repeated as most true: Yea M. *Cotton* here grants, that sundry of his own brethren and friends were possessed with a jealousie, that he was a fomenter of the spirit of *Familisme*. And what marvel of their jealousie, when the hearts of all the godly ministers were astonished to see the pest of *Familisme* overspreading all the land, and comming from M. *Cotton* his charge at *Bostone*, which was all infected, very few excepted; and yet M. *Cotton* to trouble himself no more with the matter, then if no such thing had been? yea, after he was advertised by his brethren of all the mischief, and when he had seen and heard all that past both in the general Assembly, and generall Court, yet he never called any of these flagitious hereticks to any Ecclesiastick account, till at last after the sentence of their banishment out of the land, by the admonition of the ministers of the countrey, one of them, and (as I think) but one was proceeded against. M. *Cotton* his alledgments for this his marvellous negligence will come now to be considered.

When his brethren had obtained his consent to have a Synod called, it imported no small fear in them of his errors, when they gave order as he acknowledges to search the notes of his Sermons and discourses, to gather out of them what might seem suspicious.

Concerning the fast before the Synod, and Mr. *Wheelwrights* Sermon therein, to me it seems strang how M. *Cotton* even in this place can expresse himself so tenderly about it, and without the least spark of any visible zeal against that Sermon, which for eminent sedition, grosse error, and venemous railing at all the orthodoxe both Magistrates and Ministers, had been the subject of so loud noise for a long time in all *New England*.

Mr. Cot. *still maintains against all the Divines of* New-England, *a compleat union of the soule*

The five questions which the brethren of the Synod proponed to *M. Cotton* were so answered by him, that no satisfaction was given in the particulars, so far as I can gather from his own relation. And how could such answers

with Christ, without and before all acts of Faith.

swers give satisfaction for the first hearers, that the union of Christ with the soul is compleat before and without all acts of faith? this is one of the grosse errors, even the eighteenth which in *M. Cottons* own presence in the congregation of *Bostone* was laid to Mistresse *Hutchesons* charge, and which she at last under her hand did professe to renounce.

Mr. Cottons distinction of the habite and act of faith, does not serve here for any purpose; for the habite of faith (opposite and contradistinct to the act) does not, nor cannot unite the soul to Christ, hath no operation at all, whatever power or faculty it may give to operate. What *M. Cotton* cites of Christs abiding in us, proves not his point; for Christ abides not in us before and without the act of faith wrought in us by his grace: by this act of believing in Christ we receive him. *John* 1. 12. by this act of faith the Apostle expressely tells us, that Christ abides and dwells in our hearts, *Eph.* 3. 17. by an act of this faith, *John* affirmes God to dwell in men, and men to dwell in God; and however in the act of regeneration and infusion of habits, the soul be but a passive subject; yet before our union with Christ be compleat, we by an act of our faith apprehend him who apprehended us, and we by his grace love him next who loved us first. And to compleat this union without all acts of our faith or love, we with the hereticks of *Bostone* do make the soul even united to Christ the fountain of life, to be but a dead and lifelesse Organe.

The debate of the natural priority of gracious habits unto gracious acts, is not to this question.

Mr. Cotton will have faith in justification to be meerly passive, and to act, apply, apprehend nothing at all.

Mr. Cotton in his answer to the Synods second question does change and overthrow the Protestant received doctrine of Justification; he affirmes faith to be only a passive receiving vessel of Christs righteousnes, but no active instrument to apprehend or apply any thing. That all application of Christs righteousnesse for our justification is the act of God alone, without all operation of our faith, contrary to the stream of Scripture, and Protestant writers, who ascribe justification to faith saying hold on, apprehending and applying Christs Justice for remission of sinnes. Yea, though before justification, *M. Cotton* makes faith operative, and the habit of faith to put out all acts requisite for the emptying of the vessel, and preparing the soul to receive Christ and his righteousnesse, yet in the act of justification he will have faith to act nothing at all, but to be meerly passive, a receiving vessel which acts nought, not so much as to apprehend or apply Christs righteousnesse.

Mr. Cotton seems not to be clear to evidence justification by any part of sanctification.

As for this answer to the third question, the bluntnesse of my understanding permits me not so well to take it up, as to free it of contradiction: towards the end of the Answer in terms he avowes, that faith, holinesse, or any gracious qualification, may be a good, certain, and clear evidence of justification; yet in the beginning of the Answer he seems to me to say the contrary, and the tenor of his discourse to tend to this, that the evidence of justification is not by faith, or any qualification in us, but in the spirit shining on the soule in the free promise of grace in Christ, which is the cause of faith it self, the first gracious qualification; and much more of all other posterior qualifications; so that our evidence of justification is not to be taken either from faith, or love, or contrition, or any other qualification, but alone from the spirit of illumination shining in the soul upon the absolute promises of free grace, or upon the conditional promise, but absolutely

ſolutely underſtood, not as any ground or cauſe, but as the conſequence and effect of that aſſurance. What theſe Ænigma's may may mean, *I* do not well know, or whether this may not be either the very thing, or ſomewhat near it, which was the great and moſt troubleſome queſtion about evidencing juſtification by no act of faith, nor any other part of ſanctification, but alone by the illumination and revelation of the ſpirit before, and without *Privativè & antecedenter* to all inherent qualifications and conditions, I confeſſe *I* am not free of doubt; that ſome truth may be in that ſharp cenſure which M. *Cotton* here prints, was indeed given by ſome men of place in *New England* of theſe his anſwers, that they were the *Trojane* horſe, whence moſt of the errors that troubled that land did iſſue.

On the Anſwer to the fourth queſtion I could have reſted without more inquiſition. Granting me faith and other ſaving qualifications to be true and ſolid arguments, certain effects and ſignes, and ſo reall and clear evidences of juſtification, *I* would not quarrel for the order of firſt, ſecond and third: the ſpirit blowes where he liſts, his beams may fall on any neceſſary, whether cauſe or effect, antecedent or conſequent, to make it a firſt evidence to the ſoul of its being in the ſtate of grace and juſtification, without reflection on any other ground or argument for the ſame. And whatever we ſpeak of grounds or arguments, ſignes or evidences, yet the true foundation and cauſe whereupon the faith of the beleever doth reſt in all his aſſurance, muſt be the formal object of this faith, even the promiſe of free grace holden out by the ſpirit to be apprehended by faith: other evidences are but teſtimonies, ſignes and arguments of confirmation of this prime and main one, yet ſure and divine, warranted by the word: M. *Calvine*, *Zanchie*, and all the reſt of Proteſtant Divines ſay thus much, and hereof among the Orthodox, *I* know no queſtion.

M. COTTON *ſeems to make the ſpirit alone without any act of grace in the ſoul, both to juſtify and to evidence juſtification.*

But M. *Cotton* ſeems to import ſomewhat farther, which if I miſtake him not, may imply much more then I could wiſh; to wit, that the ſpirit alone without any of his fruits: and before all the fruits, yea before faith have any being, doth himſelf immediately apply the promiſe of free grace to the ſoule, and becomes ever the firſt evidencer of juſtification by himſelf immediately and alone. If ſo, then we are not only juſtified, but our juſtification is abundantly evidenced to our ſoul without faith, without any application of any word of God to us by any act of our underſtanding or will, but alone by the acts of the holy Ghoſt. This *Calvin* and *Zanchy* are far from, and this is not unlike to be a great ground whereupon the great *Diana* of Miſtreſſe *Hutcheſon* may firmly ſtand.

M. COTTON *groundleſly diſtinguiſheth betwixt the Covenant on* Sinai, *and in the plaines of* Moab.

In the Anſwer to the fifth queſtion, I deſiderate theſe things. 1. The diſtinction of the Covenant on mount *Sinai*, from the Covenant in the plaines of *Moab*, ſeems groundleſſe. *Piſcator* and *Polanus* have no word of that diſtinction. They have no more but the common uncontroverted doctrine, that the moral law on mount *Sinai* was in it ſelf a covenant of works, and that it was repeated there, to be a Pedagogue to Chriſt, to drive in ſoules to the Covenant of grace, which was everlaſting, and had been preached to *Adam* in Paradiſe, to *Abraham* oft, to the people in the ceremonies on *Sinai*, as much as in the plains of *Moab*; and ever thereafter the Prophets till Chriſt, without the vaile of *Moſes*, did ſet it down in full plainneſſe and light. M. *Cottons* diſtinction of *Sinai* and *Moab*, I underſtand not.

Mr. Cotton *ought to have been clearer, how a Covenant of grace is applied to reprobates.*

2. What is meant by dispensing of Christ even in a taste by a Covenant of grace to reprobates, who are not elected to grace or glory, had need to be explained, lest this may be a part of that Arminianisme, which Doctor Twisse avowes he found in M. *Cottons* former Writings.

3. That which had most need to have been here explicated, was, how the Covenant of grace may be turned into a covenant of works, or may be legally applyed to reprobates. Why should this have been here totally past over, it being one of the main hinges of all the questions that then troubled *New-England*, and wherein most of all M. *Cotton* was feared to patronize Mistresse *Hutcheson* and her complices? When so direct an occasion was ministred to clear his mind of the Covenant of grace and works, why is it altogether past over?

The brethren of *New-England* upon their clear understanding of Mr. *Cottons* mind, might well entertaine all brotherly kindness with him; but the answers he gave to their questions then, or the explication he makes of these answers now, are not alledged to have contributed any thing to that kindness and concord.

None but hereticks were sent from Boston either to the Ecclesiastick Synod or civil court.

The passages of the Synod which M. *Cotton* brings for wiping off him all suspicion of favouring Mistresse *Hutcheson* her tenets, do it not so clearly as need were. The first he brings cannot but leave somewhat behind it; was it not strange that the Church of *Boston* should have sent no messenger at all to the general Assembly, but these alone who had the boldnesse openly to countenance Mistresse *Hutcheson* her errours, and that M. *Cotton* should never have suspected any such thing of them before he had heard them in the face of the Assembly, venting heresies? Yea, that thereafter all the deputies which the Town of *Boston* did send to sit in the general Court, should be so malepert hereticks, that the Court was necessitated to cast them out, not only out of that Judicatory, but to banish them the whole land. Also why does M. *Cotton* in the face of the Synod taxe the Commissioners of *Boston* for defending union with Christ for faith, and justification without faith, since himself a little before, does plead for the truth of both these tenets? I do not see how these things are consistent. Neither incommodity of expression, nor distinction of act and habit, will salve so great difference.

M. Cotton *deals scarce fairly in the Antinomian question of justification.*

The other passage which M. *Cotton* tells us out of the synod, seems to leave more upon him then it takes off; he tells us how one day publickly he went back to the house, and in the face of the whole company defended, contrary to what a little before he had given in under his hand, the *Antinomian* justification, not only without the act, but without the very habit of faith, and how he had brought for this dangerous errour divers testimonies from *Twisse*, *Chamiere*, and *Pemble*; yea, that this his Proposition had cost the Assembly another whole dayes debate, which was ended the third day by his profession to acquiesce in the Assemblies sense. Since M. *Cotton* thought fit to set down *ad longum*, the testimonies alledged by him for the *Antinomian* error in their full strength, had it not been reasonable to have set down likewise some solution of these knots, and not to have left them with a meer general offcome, that these doubts might be loosed *sano sensu*? Some would not have taken well at M. *Cottons* hand, to have produced testimonies from famous Divines bearing expressely words for Mistresse *Hutcheson* her errors without any Antidote, especially when the passages themselves did carry either in their bosome or before, or after, that Antidote which yet M.

Cotton

Cotton does altogether omit, for what cause I do not know.

In that large citation from Dr. *Twisse* a line is omitted, the bringing whereof had been a key to have opened the whole or the most of the difficultie, to wit, that the Justification which *Twisse* makes eternall, is nought but *dei Justificandi propositum quod ab æterno fuit.*

Chamiere also clears himself in the very places cited how he denies faith to be a cause of Justification; for he expressly declares that in this deniall by a cause he understands only a proper efficient, granting distinctly faith to be an instrumentall cause of Justification; and while he denies faith to impetrate Justification and to merit and work it by any proper efficiency as a work, yet he avows that faith alone does apply and truly apprehend as a divine instrument Christs righteousnesse for our Justification.

So also M. *Pemble*, while he postpones Justification to Sanctification clean contrary to *Chamiere* and *Twisse*, immediatly clears himself by a distinction of Justification *in foro dei*, and Justification *in foro conscientiæ*: these and the like clearings of the authors in the very passages cited ought not to have been omitted by M. *Cotton*.

Mr. Cottons *too great connivence at Ms.* Hutchesons *way.*

I had called *Mrs. Hutcheson M. Cottons* dear friend; this is not refused by M. *Cotton* for a long time wherin he avowes that much good was done by her to many, but nothing is spoken to that singularitie of friendship which *I* pointed at. My information was that Mrs *Hutcheson* did visite M. *Cotton* in his house much oftner then by any other of his whole flock was wont to be done, and how long it was before this frequency of visitation began to cease, whether till after the Synod, *I* cannot say. That in the time of greatest friendship M. *Cotton* did freely admonish her of what he conceived amisse in her, was well done; but in that pastorall freedome *I* desiderate these three things.

First, That he concurred with the first to cry up so much her way of discoursing with all shee met with, as gracious and usefull; while in her best times her discourse as it served to discover the sandy foundations of some, so her misplaced censuring and too narrow siting the markes of true grace, and progresse of formal hypocrites, did unsettle many more good Christians, putting them off their right ground, and casting them into needlesse doubts and irremediable plunges. 2 That shee was permitted to M. *Cottons* knowledge, on pretence of repeating his sermons, to keep ordinary and set conventicles of great numbers of persons 40. 60. 80. and more, and was never dealt with to give over these disorderly and most dangerous meetings. 3 That after the scandal of her errors did cry out to all the land to the very heavens, M. *Cotton* did never so much as move the eldership to make any search, much lesse to use any restraint of these evills. Was it so hard even after the Synod, to have gotten two witnesses of her misdemeanor, and though none could have been found, yet upon so extreamly flagrant scandals, was it not necessary to have called the partie to an accompt, had it been but upon the clamorous infamy?

Mr. Cotton *resolved to have parted from* Boston *with a partie of Mrs.* Hutchesons *late followers.*

I did speak of M. *Cottons* purpose to have sided with Mrs. *Hutcheson*, and to have separate from the Churches of *New England* as legall; M. *Cotton* grants his purpose to have indeed departed about that time from *Boston* and from the *Bay*, in the company of three score persons who had subscribed their resolution to have gone with him from thence, which persons it is like had been of Mrs *Hutchesons* side; for few other persons at all were then to be found in the Church of *Boston*, and none at all other who then were dili-

gent

rous to depart with M. *Cotton*. But M. *Cotton* will not have this removall to be any ſeparation from the Churches. This we may well queſtion, that removall being acknowledged to have been grounded upon an unjuſt miſcontent, and as many did ſee upon obſtinate errours, continued in after all the labour of the Synod to have them cured: of how dangerous a nature the matter of theſe errours was, I doe not ſpeak now.

My credulitie not ſo great as Mr. Cottons.

I ſaid that M. *Cotton* purpoſed to ſeparate from the Churches of *New England* as legal; this ſaying he will have to be falſe; I give my debtor for it *Williams* printed teſtimony. But its ſaid the man was too credulous to believe ſurmiſes, and I too credulous to take up his reports. *Anſ.* The fault of credulitie is common to me with M. *Cotton* in the ſame ſection; for he confeſſes he had been ſo raſh as to beleeve farr worſe ſurmiſes of the Supream magiſtrates in the land, and that upon theſe falſe reports he had taken up a reſolution to have departed their Jurisdiction; yea in that whole ſtory it ſeems as on the one ſide his ear had been too patent to ſurmiſes againſt the magiſtrates, ſo upon the other ſide it had been too cloſe to receive true reports of Miſtris *Hutcheſon*; for his incredulitie and careleſneſs to hear and beleeve what was too true of that miſerable woman, became very prejudiciall both to himſelf and others.

My crediting of Mr. Williams *teſtimony was not raſh.*

How ever for my credulity of M. *Williams* reports, there was firſt my conception of the mans great ſincerity, though in a very erroneous way, and of his diſpoſition, (which without any fault as I conceive, might well have been called his humour) even his great averſneſſe from reporting known lyes in a matter of fact, of any living man. Secondly, I was the more made to truſt his repore in this particular, becauſe his circumſtantiating of it to me with ſo many lively particulars of the perſons who had imployed him towards the ſavages, to buy for them a proportion of land for that new *Colonies* habitation under M. *Cottons* miniſtery, of the bargain he intended for them near *Providence* his own dwelling, of the means how that bargain miſcarried, theſe and divers other circumſtances made me think the man not likely to be totally miſtaken in that his repore. Certainly *Williams* after his baniſhment, eſpecially about the time of Miſtreſſe *Hutcheſons* cenſure, was not ſo great a ſtranger to the tranſactions of *Boſton*, as M. *Cotton* would make him. That a Commiſſion was given to him for buying of land by ſome, and ſome eminent perſons who gave it out that M. *Cotton* was to accompany them to that purchaſe as their miniſter, I have ſtill ſo much credulity as to believe that M. *Williams* in this did not countenance any lye, how little hand ſoever M. *Cotton* might have in that buſineſſe.

M. Winthrop and Mr. Wels teſtimony not well anſwered by Mr. Cotton.

But however theſe things might be in my book, I laid but little ſtreſſe on the teſtimonies either of Miſtris *Hutcheſon* and her followers or of M. *Williams*; the witneſs I ſtood upon were M. *Winthrop* and M. *Wels* which M. *Cotton* I knew would not refuſe, and the depoſitions I took from them were not theſe whereupon M. *Cotton* very needleſſy ſpends his 56 and 57 pages, but as my book beares expreſſely, the other following, which how well M. *Cotton* takes off, let it now be conſidered.

I took it for a threwd reflection on M. *Cotton*, that M. *Winthrop* and M. *Wells* had teſtified in print how all his flock, a very few excepted, had been infected with Miſtreſſe *Hutcheſons* errors; againſt which, his colleague M. *Wilſon* had been a zealous oppoſer, for which cauſe he had been greatly maligned of them; but M. *Cotton* much magnified. M. *Cottons* anſwer to this is, that the moſt of *Boſton* did conſent with

Miſtreſſe

Mistresse *Hutchesson* only, while she held openly out no more then what by him in the congregation was publickly taught; but when she fell into horrible and evident errors, the whole Church did agree to her admonition and excommunication.

This answer is not satisfactory; for my witnesses made the most of *Boston* not only joyners with her in the publick doctrine, which had been no fault, if the publick doctrine were good; but they deponed that they were infected with her errors, and were true converts to her evill opinions. Secondly, her excommunication was for no error at all, but only for evill manners in lying, and therefore the performance of it put off from M *Cotton* the teacher, to M. *Wilson* the Pastor; many might have consented to her excommunication for manifest lying, who in their heart did fully enough consent to her erroneous doctrines. Thirdly, M. *Cotton* does not, nor I think can he say, that all, or the half of *Boston* had at that time relinquished *M. Hutchesson* her *Antinomian* errors; especially anent the legality of evidencing Justification by Sanctification, nor that the 60, who invited him to leave *Boston* after that time, were free of these doctrines.

The second testimony I brought from the short story was that M. *Cotton* had never called any of his flock to any accompt for any errour. He answers that they were so cautious as never to vent her errours; how can this answer satisfie? had not all the comissioners of the Church of *Boston* in the face of the Gentlemen, as M. *Cotton* himself hearing and reproving them, defended these errors? Also had not all the deputies of the town of *Boston* in the face of the Gentlemens Court so farr joyned in these heresies that they behoved to be banished the land? when all *New England* for diverse years had been so lamentably vexed with the pest of *Boston*, could never so much as one man be found guilty of the crime? for never so much as one was called to an accompt in *Boston*, though in *Roxbury* and elsewhere, where the evill was incomparable lesse, sundry were excommunicate.

The third testimony I brought, was, that in face of the generall court and in M. *Cottons* own hearing Mistris *Hutcheson* had avowed M. *Cottons* sealing with the spirit of the gospel and preaching free grace according to her mind, while as all the other preachers of *New England* except him and M. *Wheelwright*, wanted the spirit of grace, and were but legall preachers. M. *Cotton* answers, that her testimony was but like that of the Pythonisse witnessing to *Paul* for the disgrace of his ministry. This answer would have been satisfactory, unlesse M. *Cotton* had immediately in expresse termes cleared Mistris *Hutcheson* of all evill mention towards himself and his ministery. 2. This testimony of Mistris *Hutchesons* concerning M. *Cotton* his consenting with her in all the tenets she had vented before that time, was not her testimony alone, but all her followers also who were almost the whole people of *Boston*. 3. The carriage of that businesse, as it is set down in that short story, and in this vindication by M. *Cotton* himself, for his refusing of her testimony, makes notwithstanding all his speeches of her and to her, before the sentence of her banishment, of a far other strain then were these of his colleague, M. *Wilson* or any other either of the Ministers or Magistrates, who were opposites to her.

Mr. Cottons carriage in the condemnation of Wheelwrigt, not fair.

A fourth testimony I brought from M. *Winthrop*, and M. *Wells*, was M. *Cotton* his open dissent in the face of the Gent. Court from the rest of his brethren about M. *Wheelwrights* doctrine, and that after a nights advisement was craved by the Ministers of the Court, and obtained. The next morning, all the rest of the Ministers did clearly testifie against the dangerous falshood of M. *Wheelwrights* doctrine, at that time of great hazard to the very lives of the most of the gra-

cious people of *New-England* by the seditious Sermons of *Wheelwright*; M. *Cottons* testimony against him had been very advantageous, and was craved by the Gen. Court, and obtained from all the rest of his brethren liberally: notwithstanding M. *Cotton* does refuse his, but upon two reasons. First, because he was not present with his brethren when they examined *Wheelwrights* Sermon, is this reason good? when a whole night was given to that deliberation, why did he absent himself from it? Secondly, was not that Sermon in writing delivered many dayes before that night by M. *Wheelwright* under his hand unto the Court, to be cognoscent upon by all who pleased so long as they thought expedient? Thirdly, was not that Sermon taught on a Fast day at *Boston* in M. *Cotton* his Pulpit, and hearing as I conceive? and however was there any Minister in *New England* so near, and so intimely acquainted with all M. *Wheelwrights* doctrine and conversation, as M. *Cotton*? Fourthly, though M. *Wheelwright* was condemned by the Gen. Court, to be banished as a most dangerous, erroneous, and seditious Preacher, from whom the Tragedy of ministers was feared more then from any other of the hereticks, and all this to the good liking of all the rest of the ministers of *New-England*: Notwithstanding *M. Cotton* when so oft in this writ he falls to speak of him, there is not one word drops from his pen which implies his consent to this day, unto that sentence against Mr. *Wheelwright*.

The second reason which *M. Cotton* alledges for his dissent from his brethren about *Wheelwrights* Sermon, is, That he knew not whether the ministers of the countrey did preach that which M. *Wheelwright* did call a Covenant of works, to wit, the evidencing of justification by acts of sanctification. But first, was M. *Cotton* such a stranger in *Israel*, as not to know the common doctrine of the brethren in the land, no more then he did know the ordinary tenets of the most of his own people at *Boston*, which were yet their daily talk, and from thence made a loud noise in all the land? Secondly, how did all the rest of the ministers know without scruple the doctrine one of another in that common head, when M. *Cotton* was ignorant thereof? Thirdly, did not M. *Cotton* beside many private conferences on that subject, in the face of the general Assembly hear his brethren declare themselves against M. *Wheelwright* in his debates upon that infamous matter? notwithstanding of all these things, M. *Cotton* passes from this testimony as abundantly well answered.

A prime testimony past by M. Cotton.

My next testimony is omitted, on design or otherwayes I know not: to me it seemed weighty, for it did say, that in the audience of the Gen. Court, and a number of the ministers there present, it was told M. *Wheelwright*, that well near all the ministers were contrary to him, in his tenet of evidencing justification by sanctification: this, well near by all, imported clearly some of the ministers present, were not contrary to him in that tenet, as both he and all the company judge it: who could these some be but M. *Cotton?* for no other minister neither there present, nor in the whole land, were ever alledged to be in *Wheelwrights* mind in that tenet.

Great prevarication in shifting Wheelwright *from censure.*

The sixt testimony *I* brought from M. *Winthrop* and M. *Wells*, concerning M. *Cotton* his total neglect, to have any the least Church-censure put either upon M. *Wheelwright* or Mistris *Hutcheson*, or any of his congregation, who after these two, were the prime leaders of others into error; for the third, the prime seducers in *Boston*, M. *Cotton* answers, that their fault was in private, and so not censurable. To this I will not repeat my former replies.

For M. *Wheelwright*, that he was never censured, who can be pleased with it? when the

the general Court, and all the ministers present, had referred his silencing to the Church of *Boston*, should they have neglected that duty? If a most turbulent and dangerously seditious heretick, tried and found by a supream Court, cannot be gotten censured with the least Ecclesiastick reproof, when he has once gotten the plurality of a small congregation to be for him, does not this inconvenient evidence that there must be a material defect in the congregational discipline? Secondly, it seems in M. *Wheelwrights* case, the default was more in the men then in the way: for his charge a very little before had been a part of the Church of *Boston*, and then he was censurable by them: but they to ease themselves of the burthen of that proces, did erect that portion of their number, the most whereof *Wheelwright* had seduced into a Church state by himself: by this means making them and their Pastor *Wheelwright* absolute Independent, and uncensurable by all *New England*, or by all the world. Thirdly, the chief cause why he was not censured, seems to have been none of the former, but a third, which M. *Cotton* ingenuously does here confesse; to wit, that all M *Wheelwrights* offence was but in some unsafe and incommodious expressions, and that neither himself nor the Church of *Boston* did take *Wheelwright* for an *Antinomian* or a *Familist*; but a man opposite to both. This to me seems strange language, that *Wheelwright* condemned by the general Court, and all the ministers of *New-England*, as a man worthy of banishment for his errors and high sedition, should yet by M. *Cotton* be absolved, and only tenderly noted for some unsafe expressions, but clearly pronounced free of *Familistick* and *Antinomian* errors, because he did not join with M. *Gortine*, or with Mistris *Hutcheson*, when she came to her highest excesse, wherein few of her old most intimate friends were able to follow her.

Mr. *Cotton* had much need to expresse what of these errors debated in the Synod, he counts blasphemous and heretical, and what but only uncommodious expressions; since distinctly he puts in this last order, not only these that are near his own five questions, but even all that was charged on *Wheelwright*, whether before the Assembly or Court, particularly his making it a covenant of works, when any thing but Christ alone, whether faith or repentance, or any other part of sanctification, is made a means of knowledge, to evidence and assure our justification. When this and such other of *Wheelwrights* doctrines, are declared by all the ministers of the Assembly to be so erroneous and dangerous, as that in their judgment they call for a new Christ and a new Gospel, being sure that old Christ and the old Gospel will not own nor justifie them, how is it that M. *Cotton* will have all to be but faults in expressions? may this be the Commentary of M. *Wells* story, where he sayes that divers ministers declared their grief for *Wheelwrights* doctrine, as if M. *Cotton* in this also had dissented from the rest of his brethren.

Mr. COTTONS *scarce straight dealing with Mistresse* Hutcheson.

To M *Cottons* Answers for the sparing of Mistris *Hutcheson*, I reply no more then before, but these two or three words. First, why M. *Cotton* did never so much as advise her to put down weekly Lectures, nor in the least, so far as was known, did ever taxe her for them. Secondly, why did never M. *Cotton* testifie against her publick affronts oftimes in his sight, offered by her to his colleague M. *Wilson*, while frequently she left the congregation, and by example moved many to do the like, when he came to preach or pray? Thirdly, wherefore was she never admonished for her prior errors, were they but only in expressions, as M. *Cotton* avowes M. *Wheelwrights* were? That admonition she got, and the censure which came upon her, were only for these errors she vented after the sentence of her banishment, and for her grosse living: and these censures were inflicted upon the

cious people of *New-England* by the ſeditious Sermons of *Wheelwright*; M. *Cottons* teſtimony againſt him had been very advantageous, and was craved by the Gen. Court, and obtained from all the reſt of his brethren liberally: notwithſtanding M. *Cotton* does refuſe his, but upon two reaſons. Firſt, becauſe he was not preſent with his brethren when they examined *Wheelwrights* Sermon, is this reaſon good? when a whole night was given to that deliberation, why did he abſent himſelf from it? Secondly, was not that Sermon in writing delivered many dayes before that night by M. *Wheelwright* under his hand unto the Court, to be cognoſcent upon by all who pleaſed ſo long as they thought expedient? Thirdly, was not that Sermon taught on a Faſt day at *Boſton* in M. *Cotton* his Pulpit, and hearing as I conceive? and however was there any Miniſter in *New England* ſo near, and ſo intimely acquainted with all M. *Wheelwrights* doctrine and converſation, as M. *Cotton*? Fourthly, though M. *Wheelwright* was condemned by the Gen. Court, to be baniſhed as a moſt dangerous, erroneous, and ſeditious Preacher, from whom the Tragedy of miniſters was feared more then from any other of the hereticks, and all this to the good liking of all the reſt of the miniſters of *New-England*: Notwithſtanding *M. Cotton* when ſo oft in this writ he falls to ſpeak of him, there is not one word drops from his pen which implies his conſent to this day, unto that ſentence againſt Mr. *Wheelwright*.

The ſecond reaſon which *M. Cotton* alledges for his diſſent from his brethren about *Wheelwrights* Sermon, is, That he knew not whether the miniſters of the countrey did preach that which M. *Wheelwright* did call a Covenant of works, to wit, the evidencing of juſtification by acts of ſanctification. Bu ſuch a ſtranger in *Iſrael*, as not to know the common doctrine land, no more then he did know the ordinary tenets of the moſt *Boſton*, which were yet their daily talk, and from thence made land? Secondly, how did all the reſt of the miniſters know w trine one of another in that common head, when M. *Cotton* Thirdly, did not M. *Cotton* beſide many private conferences on face of the general Aſſembly hear his brethren declare themſelve *wright* in his debates upon that infamous matter? notwithſtandi M. *Cotton* paſſes from this teſtimony as abundantly well anſwere

A prime teſtimony paſt by M. Cotton.

My next teſtimony is omitted, on de know not: to me it ſeemed weighty, for it audience of the Gen. Court, and a num there preſent, it was told M. *Wheelwright*, that well near all the miniſters were contrary to him, in his tenet of evidencing juſtification by ſanctification: this, well near by all, imported clearly ſome of the miniſters preſent, were not contrary to him in that tenet, as both he and all the company judge it: who could theſe ſome be but M. *Cotton*? for no other miniſter neither there preſent, nor in the whole land, were ever alledged to be in *Wheelwrights* mind in that tenet.

Great prevarication in ſhifting Wheelwright *from cenſure.*

The ſixt teſtimony *I* brought from M. *Winthrop* and M. *Wells*, concerning M. *Cotton* his total neglect, to have any the leaſt Church-cenſure put either upon M. *Wheelwright* or Miſtris *Hutcheſon*, or any of his congregation, who after theſe two, were the prime leaders of others into errors, for the third, the prime ſeducers in *Boſton*, M. *Cotton* anſwers, that their fault was in private, and ſo not cenſurable. To this I will not repeat my former replies.

For M. *Wheelwright*, that he was never cenſured, who can be pleaſed with it? when the

IRREGULA
PAGINA

the general Court, and all the ministers present, had referred his silencing to the Church of *Boston*, should they have neglected that duty? If a most turbulent and dangerously seditious heretick, tried and found by a supream Court, cannot be gotten censured with the least Ecclesiastick reproof, when he has once gotten the plurality of a small congregation to be for him, does not this inconvenient evidence that there must be a material defect in the congregational discipline? Secondly, it seems in M. *Wheelwrights* case, the default was more in the men then in the way: for his charge a very little before had been a part of the Church of *Boston*, and then he was censurable by them: but they to ease themselves of the burthen of that process, did erect that portion of their number, the most whereof *Wheelwright* had seduced into a Church-state by himself: by this means making them and their Pastor *Wheelwright* absolute Independent, and uncensurable by all *New England*, or by all the world. Thirdly, the chief cause why he was not censured, seems to have been none of the former, but a third, which M. *Cotton* ingenuously does here confesse; to wit, that all M *Wheelwrights* offence was but in some unsafe and incommodious expressions, and that neither himself nor the Church of *Boston* did take *Wheelwright* for an *Antinomian* or a *Familist*, but a man opposite to both. This to me seems strange language, that *Wheelwright* condemned by the general Court, and all the ministers of *New-England*, as a man worthy of banishment for his errors and high sedition, should yet by M. *Cotton* be absolved, and only tenderly noted for some unsafe expressions, but clearly pronounced free of *Familistick* and *Antinomian* errors, because he did not join with M. *Gortine*, or with Mistris *Hutcheson*, when she came to her highest ex-

[illegible] friends were able to follow her.

[illegible] what of these errors debated in the Synod, [illegible] what but only uncommodious expressions; [illegible], nor only these that are near his own five [illegible] *Wheelwright*, whether before the Assem- [illegible] it a covenant of works, when any thing but [illegible], or any other part of sanctification, is [illegible] and assure our justification. When this [illegible], are declared by all the ministers of the As- [illegible] that in their judgment they call for a new [illegible] old Christ and the old Gospel will not own [illegible] will have all to be but faults in expressi- [illegible] M. *Wells* story, where he sayes that divers ministers declared their grief for *Wheelwrights* doctrine, as if M. *Cotton* in this also had dissented from the rest of his brethren.

Mr. COTTONS *scarce straight dealing with Mistresse* Hutcheson.

To M *Cottons* Answers for the sparing of Mistris *Hutcheson*, I reply no more then before, but these two or three words. First, why M. *Cotton* did never so much as advise her to put down weekly Lectures, nor in the least, so far as was known, did ever taxe her for them. Secondly, why did never M. *Cotton* testifie against her publick affronts oftimes in his sight, offered by her to his colleague M. *Wilson*, while frequently she left the congregation, and by example moved many to do the like, when he came to preach or pray? Thirdly, wherefore was she never admonished for her prior errors, were they but only in expressions, as M. *Cotton* avowes M. *Wheelwrights* were? That admonition she got, and the censure which came upon her, were only for these errors she vented after the sentence of her banishment, and for her grosse living: and these censures were inflicted upon the

upstrange of strangers, and that too late after her imprisonment, albeit in the face of the general court and *M. Cotton*, before not two or three, but a great assembly of witnesses, she had declared her mind of her revelations, of her grievous spite and contumelies against all the Magistrates, and of the graceless legality of all the ministers both of old and *New-England*, except *M. Cotton* and *M. Wheelwright* alone.

That in the end of this long Section, *M. Cotton* prayes to God for me, I thank him heartily, and from my hearts desires I had clear grounds to pronounce him totally innocent of all I laid to his charge. These divers years I have lived in a corner, removed from the certain knowledge of things belonging to these transactions; but upon the most equitable consideration of every part of this *M. Cottons* Apology which yet I have attained unto, I cannot for my part pronounce *M. Cotton* so free of these things as I wish I might.

SECT. XIV.

Concerning Mr. *Cottons* grief and repentance.

THis Section speaks to two points: First, to my Caveat I gave upon supposition that my information of *M. Cotton* had been true.

M. COTTONS *obstinacy.*

It is answered, that though it had been true, yet the way of Independency would not have been more the worse thereof then was the way of Christianity for *Peters* falls, but rather the better, that way having recovered him from these falls. I love not to debate supposed causes; but if *Peter* had not recovered his fall, or had he continued obstinate in its defence, the way wherein he was a chief leader, had fared much the worse for him. This is a part of *M. Cottons* case; no error, nor any affinity to error, which was laid to his charge, is in the least degree acknowledged, but all either peremptorily denied or stoutly defended; upon how good grounds I shall not pronounce, but leave it to *M. Cotton* himself, on the review of my reply to pronounce.

M COTTONS *unreasonable bitterness.*

The other part of the Section meets with what I spoke of *M. Cottons* humiliation, and rebukes from his brethren of the Synod. I will not say that *M. Cotton* here is passionate; only I must say his rebukes are severe enough. My words must be words of such infamy and reproach, that neither the Congregational nor Presbyterian discipline, nor moral philosophy would passe without a full reproof; they must violate the plain and obvious rule of the Apostle, and that not the first time; they must violate the rule both of love and truth. Was not this enough, but that yet over and above my words must have twice the lye in end, and be protested to be untrue, and ungrave, and must untruth? Now for what is all this? only because I say, that I was informed of *M. Cotton* his deep humiliation in the time of the general Assembly and Court, for what he heard from his brethren. This I spake of *M. Cotton* for no imputation, but his great praise, whereby all that might stick of the former reports was wiped away; yet *M. Cotton* will not have it so be so, but absolutely denies that he had any grief at all, either then or thereafter for any the least guilt he ever had of any of the errors that then were in Boston, but professes three parts of four, or rather five of six of the grief which then he had, to have been for his Orthodox brethren, and that for these things in them which they and I did count their Christian, necessary, and very commendable duty: he professes his grief was first, That such who endeavoured to heal

the

the distempers of *New England* were transported with more jealousies, heats, and paroxysmes of spirit then would stand with brotherly love and the rules of the Gospel. Secondly, that in the clearing of the field of God, some good wheat, some simple hearted-honest men were plucked up with the tares. Thirdly, that some truths of God fared the worse for their resemblance to errors.

When M. *Cotton* is pleased to lash and overlash with his pen the general Assembly, and general court of *New England*, why should I take in any evil part a whip with the scourge?

However the testimony I gave here of M. *Cotton* his repentance, (intending it in truth for his promise) I had it from an *English* Preacher, who was with us in *Scotland* at the framing of the Solemn League and Covenant, who returned to *England* in the same shipe with the *English* and *Scottish* Commissioners; if I remember his name, 'twas Mr. *Higgison* who was present at the Synod of *New England*, his brother being Clerk thereof: he told me distinctly in *Worcester* house, that M. *Cotton* was so far cast down for what he met with from his brethren of the Synod, that one day coming out of the Assembly, he sate down alone on a Cartwheel in the way, in more grief and perplexity of heart, then for any cause with men had ever befallne him; as for his secrets with God, they were not spoken of; be this true or false, I fained nothing of it, nor for my reporting it from such a ground, and on such an occasion, did I deserve (as I conceive) so bitter a censure.

SECT. XV.

The fruits of *Independency* and *Brownisme* compared.

I Had instituted a comparison betwixt the way of the *Brownists* and *Independents*, to try which of the two had brought forth the sweetest fruits; I said the fruits of Independency had been worth in seven years, then of *Brownisme* in fifty. This I call a broad assertion; M. *Cotton* assignes the reason, because without the dimension of all truth: yet, when the weakness of what is here opposite by him to the proofs of this assertion, does upon little trial clearly appear, it will be found that my assertion is rather too narrow then too broad, that I might well have extended its dimensions, and kept within the terms of truth. M. *Cotton* warranted me to prolong the duration of *Brownisme* beyond fifty to eighty seven years; if I had said that *Independency* in seven years had born better fruits then *Brownisme* in fourscore and seven, it easily could be made good. But if the unexpected plenty of the worst apples of *Sodom*, which have grown on that unhappy plant, since the time of my writing be looked upon, that broad assertion will be found exceedingly narrow, and much within what the world has seen and felt, for their lamentable woe to be too true.

My broad assertion but narrow.

I laid for a foundation of my parallel betwixt *Brownists* and *Independents*, in their fruits, that the way of both is really one: and upon this Identity I spent two chief Chapters of my book, the examination wherevof M. *Cotton* referres to its proper place. O if M. *Cotton* had been pleased to have performed that his undertaking, it had been much more acceptable and profitable to the world, then all the rest of his labour in this Treatise. But the pity is, M. *Cotton* has had no leasure for that part of his promised task.

Mr. COTTONS *clear miſtakes.*

That I did call the Divines of *New England* who now manage that controverſie, the beſt Patrons of Independency, it was I hope not near to any blaſphemy; for I ſpoke it clearly but of humane Patrons. M. *C.* knew that I was far from aſcribing to Chriſt the patrociny of that which I count an error. Alſo while I made the Magiſtrates of *New-England*, to be at the miniſters devotion, it was clear I meant not devotion in the ſenſe of the Schooles, as if the miniſters in *New England* had been idolized, and adored as gods; But I took the word in the vulgar and ordinary ſenſe, even this, that the Magiſtrates there ſo loved the miniſters, that they openly and heartily embraced their Congregational way, an advantage which no *Browniſt* to this day could ever attaine.

The way of Independency long in the dark.

What I ſaid of the darkneſſe of the way of Independents, related to that time of my writing, and to my own knowledge: now indeed the Independents way is not ſo obſcure as then it was: I ſpoke it alſo much in relation to the Congregational Divines of the Aſſembly, who for ſome years by no intreaty would be moved to ſpeak out the way they would pitch upon, but choſe rather to let books againſt them lie unanſwered, though of very near concernment, before they would break the deſign of their reſolved ſilence: all this was ſpoken in compariſon with the *Browniſts*, whoſe contraty ſcriptitations had divulged all their diviſions, which the Writings of Independents had not done in any ſuch degree, though they had occaſions large as pregnant alſo as the other. This piece of Independent Policy makes their ſtory to this day lie much in the dark, when the moſt of the feats of the *Browniſts* are long agoe proclaimed on the houſe tops, and ſet on the heads of the higheſt hills, by the hand of their moſt eminent friends.

SECT. XVI.

The firſt abſurdity in the way of *Independency*, is their holding out the moſt part of Chriſtian people from all Church-fellowſhip.

The Browniſts *not ſo unhappy in keeping out others from Church fellowſhip, as the Independents.*

THe firſt abſurdity I did aſſign to Independency above *Browniſme*, was, the keeping out of all Chriſtian Churches, thouſands of good Chriſtians. M. *Cotton* tells me I forgot my ſelf here, while I make the Independents go beyond the *Browniſts* in this practiſe. *Anſw.* This is not forgetfulneſſe. I did never deny the *Browniſts* agreeance with Independents in this principle, yea, I ſhew the *Browniſts* to be the others maſters into it; but what I ſpake was in the practiſe of the principle: The *Browniſts* were never tempted, nor had ever the occaſion offered unto them, to keep either thouſands or hundreds, or ſcores out of any Church; for we never heard, that ſo many who had offered themſelves to their fellowſhip, had at any time been rejected of them: But in *New England*, another Nation, (as they ſpeak) did deſire to joyn with the Independents, and the moſt have been refuſed. That they were admitted to come within the doors of the Church to hear and ſee, is nothing at all to the purpoſe, this was never denied to the *Indian* Pagans. My words were clear of Church-membership; M. *Cotton* profeſſeth it is boldneſſe in me to deny that they hold out ſo much as one perſon who had been reputed a good Chriſtian in old *England*, and whom themſelves durſt not deny to be ſuch: yet when at the firſt bout I told him they had kept out

twenty

twenty thousand of this sort; and proved it by their own testimonies, Consider what is answered.

In New-England above 20000 kept out of the Churches.

My first testimony was from the answerer to the thirtie two questions, which I took for M. *Cotton* himself; in this he tells me I am mistaken; yet not very farr; for though M. *Mader* is now declared the author of these answers, yet M *Cotton* avowes his approbation of them all.

The first question of the ministers of old *England* to these of *New-England* was, whither the greatest part of the English which (without *M. Cottons* contradiction) I made twentie thousand, were not kept out of all Churches? The answer which *M. Cotton* does not yet amend, is not a denyall, but rather a clear grant of the question, to wit, that in the bounds which they knew best, more then the half of the heads of families were admitted, and beside those many children and servants.

This limitation of heads of families imports that they durst not say the half of the persons were admitted; for in every family the children and servants in ordinary make three for one to the heads; so the admission of the greater number of the heads of families with the exclusion of the greater number of the members of families stands well with the exclusion of the number of the whole, which is beyond my allegeance.

Mr. Cotton repeats not faithfully M. Maders reasons.

For this strange practise *M. Cotton* wills us to consider *M. Maders* reasons, and for that end here reprints them, which was not needfull; for the question was only of the fact, and not at all of its reasons: As for the reasons which *M. Cotton* here brings, if I had done it in his fashion, he had without doubt told me of it. Beside the addition in the frontispeice which is *M. Cottons* own, and no word of it in *M. Maders*, the second reason he clearly transformes. *M. Mader* had made it indeed according to the practise of *New England*, that of these who came from old *England* after the time of triall, many (not as *M. Cotton* diminishes it sundry) were excluded from all Churches on this ground that they were carnall, that is, not regenerate: and the reason why they were accounted such, was because they gave no testimony of being members of Christ; for this the Church had no warrant to receive them as members.

M. Cotton dissembles all this, and for the alledged practise of exclusion, he makes some be excluded only because they were scandalous: *M. Mader* said no such thing; what *M. Cotton* brings would have agreed all; for who will deny but scandalous persons coming from a farr should be kept out of Churches till they have given satisfaction for their scandals? But the question was of many thousands who in old *England* had lived without all scandal, and had been reputed there good Christians, alwayes partaking of Church ordinances without any impediment, yet could not be admitted to any Church fellowship in *New-England*, without a new longsome tryall: In the which, fairnesse of profession, want of scandal, and this addition as a proofe of reallitie, a leaving of their native country, a undertaking a dangerous voyage even to a new world for the libertie and purity of Church ordinances; all this would not suffice; But as in this same section M. *Cotton* lets fall there behoved to be farther a positive affirmation of true grace; it not being enough that none could deny them to be truly godly, it behoved to be affirmed that they were spiritual and so regenerat; hereof there behoved to be certain signes, satisfying the body, at least the pluralitie of the people, not officers alone: This being the rule of admission, what marvell the half of any societie and many more should be for ever excluded?

My

Many more then the half of Christians in New-England *are out of all Churches.*

My ſecond teſtimony was from M. *Lechford*, who depoſed that three parts of four in *New England* were out of all Church fellowſhip. What infamy M. *Cotton* caſts on this man, I can ſay nothing to it; for *I* know little of his cauſe; only it ſeems a worſe qualified man may be admitted to teſtifie, in a matter of fact which lay under his eye for four years together: eſpecially when this fact is according to the principles which M. *Cotton* avowes in the ſame ſection, when he tells us that it is not enough to a Church admiſſion that none dare deny a man to be religious, but that poſitively we muſt know him to be ſo, at leaſt in the judgement of charitie; and this, as elſwhere its declared, by convincing evidences ſatisfying the congregation, that theſe who are to be admitted be truely ſpiritual, of a golden mettall, not lead.

By this means all the ſtanding Churches in *Brittaine*, yea *Europe*, muſt at once be diſſolved, & the beſt of them made but as a quarry whence ſtones may be hewen, and members gathered for a new *Independent* congregation: into which we ſee viſibly, of all who hitherto without ſcruple have been admitted in our Churches to the holy table, ſcarce the tenth man would be accepted. I doe not ſay to the holy table (as M. *Cotton* would diminiſh the matter) but not to any part of Church-fellowſhip, themſelvs behoved to be excluded from the benefit of diſcipline and ſacraments, and their children from baptiſme: what diſhonour to God, and cruelrie againſt the ſoules of men would that demolition and devaſtation of Churches be, which now the world ſees the way of *Independency* does diligently labour to procure, any may judge.

Concerning M. *Lechford* this paſſage requires clearing; how M. *Cotton* makes the only cauſe of his exclusion from Church fellowſhip, to be two errors: whereof *I* ſuppone the ſecond, of the Apoſtolique authoritie continuing to this day in Epiſcopacy, to be the more dangerous; when notwithſtanding he tells us that none in *New-England* are excluded from Church-fellowſhip for maintaining the authority of Biſhops; yea that ſundry in theſe Churches are knowne allowers both of Epiſcopall and Presbyteriall government without all quarell for that cauſe from any. I ſee not how theſe things doe conſiſt one with another or with the truth of the *Independents* tenets and practiſes either in *New-England* or elſwhere, which *I* have proved to be falſe otherwayes in my. 6. cap. at R. yet without any anſwer.

My Third teſtimony was from M. *Williams*, as one of the Engliſh Independents, (though he was gone fare beyond them in his new ſecking) in a point which ſeems not to goe an haires breadth from the foundation of *Independency*. *Williams* does not deny more then M. *Cotton*; that thouſands of perſons in nationall Churches are to be counted precious Saints; only he ſayes that every nationall Church is of a vitious conſtitution, and that the body of people in nationall Churches are unregenerate. In this M. *Cotton* will be found alſo forward as *Williams*: yea (ſo far as *I* know either of the principles or practiſe of Independents) all of them will have Churches gathered out of the beſt reformed in *Europe*, being unwilling to live either as officers or members in any of them: which is to put them all in a high degree in the condition of heathens and publicans.

But what need we debate on the teſtimony either of *Mader*, *Lechford* or *Williams* for proving of that which ſenſe muſt deſide? *I* ſaid the half of the people of *New-England*, to whom I was ſo charitable as to count them all (with the exception of a few) for Chriſtians of a faire profeſſion, without ſcandal, every way alſo good as the greateſt half of the members of *Boſton*, to be holden from all Church membership: If M. *Cotton* will aſſure us its otherwayes, *I* ſhall yeild this point; but as yet he has

ſaid

said no such thing; for his assertion, that not one man whom they count religious is excluded, will signifie nothing at all; for it comes to this question, whether the half of the people of *New-England* above twentie thousand persons, have been actually counted by their neighbours so religious as to be admitted members in any congregation? If *M. Cotton* will assert the affirmative, I shall give over my contradiction; but withall I must be pardoned to avow that which is visible in old *England* and *Scotland*, that by the principles and practise of Independents there, not only the half but the six or tenth part of these who before were Church-members, should not be admitted to any Church privledge. In this assertion let not only reason, but daily sense be judge.

SECT. XVII.

Independencie marres the propagation of the gospell, and the conversion of *Pagans*.

I Said Independencie had exceedingly hindred the conversion of the Pagans neer *New-England*. *Mr. Cotton* makes this a sinfull and shamefull calumny; where words are so hard, arguments proving them had need to be also hard. I said *Independent* principles did further the neglect of preaching to any who were without or unconverted; for they tie the pains of pastors only to their owne particular congregations; they admit not in any pastor a relation to a Church universall visible, as all other divines maintain pastors to have; no dutie lies upon Independent ministers as pastors without their congregation; if they happen to preach to others, its but as gifted men without any charge, and within their charge they suppose all and every one to be converted at their first reception. If they have any doubt of their conversion, upon that doubt and unsatisfaction they hold him out.

If notwithstanding of these and the like arguments, the *Independents* can labour in preaching to others without their flocks for their conversion, and that as pastors they can find themselves obliged in conscience to bring in all they can to the faith of Christ, I shall be glad of it; and if they be constant in that duty, I shall not much put them to reconcile that practise with their principles, neither need I; for the pith of my argument was on their practises more then on their principles.

M. Cottons needlesse digression to the high publique praises of his owne partie.

I alledged that none of them (so farr as I know) had minded to thirdway the work of the Pagans conversion, though both the *Spaniards* and *Hollanders*, yea the *English* who were either prelaticall or popish, had done some thing in that kind: upon this occasion *M. Cotton* runs out pathetically to praise the labours of the *Independent* divines. I use to be very farr from bereaving any creature of their due praise; with much refreshment of heart have I oft read the gracious treatises of diverse congregational divines, and it is my earnest wish they would continue in those most profitable and most pleasant labours; but truly there was no occasion given here to *Mr. Cotton* of falling out on that subject; and what here I am prayed in the name of God to put all the servants of Christ living in all the reformed Churches together, and to take notice that the *Independents* alone, yea these of them only who belong to *New-England* and *London*, have published more treatises upon the work of conversion then all the other; from another pen then *M. Cottons* I would have taken this for an insolent *Rodomontado*; that which is brought for its cover is but

the leaf of a figtree, to wit, that all this is ſpoken to refute my unjuſt and unworthy ſcandal; for I wrote no word that gave it the leaſt occaſion: all that I ſpoke of the Independents neglect of the Pagans converſion, when pregnant opportunities thereof had been put in their hand, is ſo abſolutely true, that when M. *Cotton* would refute it, he comes but ſmall ſpeed in that labour.

An hearty example of the reformation which may be expected from Independents.

The meſſengers which the brethren of *New England* did ſend for the converſion of the prophane *Engliſh* Chriſtians in *Virginia* and the *Barbadoes*, makes nought to our preſent queſtion of the *Indian* Pagans. What alſo may be theſe converſions of the *Barbadoes* and *Virginia*, which M. *Cotton* ſpeaks of, I do not know: *If* they be like to theſe which M. *White* by help and encouragement, as he ſayes in his book againſt M. *Prin* from *New England*, did perform about the ſame time in the *Bermudaes*, for my own part, I do not love them. For M. *White* profeſſes there without any circumlocution, a formal diſſolution of all the well ſetled Churches in theſe flouriſhing *Ilands*; and all the Miniſters and Elders renunciation of their offices, that out of divers Churches of many thouſands diſſolved, one voluntary aſſociation of a little handful might be ſet up in a Church: wherein of all the former miniſters only, one was choſen to be a Paſtor, and another for a ruling Elder, but the body of the people was kept from all Church Ordinances, never to be admitted to any, till they were found fit to be in a Church-ſtate, by theſe few who had diſſolved the former Churches, and caſt themſelves in the new Independent mule.

An hearty applauding to all the labourers in New England, *in the converſion of the* Pagans.

The only thing that M. *Cotton* brings here to the purpoſe in hand, is the labour of M. *Eliot* of *Roxburie*; but that does not meet my exceptions; for M. *Eliots* firſt attempt was an whole year after my admonition was printed. What M. *Cotton* ſpeaks here of M *Eliots* ſucceſſe with the poor Pagans, I heartily rejoyce at it, and for what I hear more of this happy work of State I bleſſe God, and would be glad not only with my prayers, but alſo with my poor purſe, or any other endeavour which were in my mean power, to advance any undertaking which is in hand, either in the new or old *England* for that ſervice, and willingly ſhall lay down all quarrelling of former neglects, when after my admonition I find it ſo carefully amended, and that with good ſucceſſe from the Lord.

I do alſo much applaud the wiſdome and zeal of the miniſter of *New Plimmouth*, that when the Separatiſts of that Church had as good as deſerted all the Ordinances, fleeing out againſt all the good lawes of *New-England* into *Familiſme* and ſuch other hereſies, he turned himſelf to beſtow his labours upon a fitter ſubject of grace then they, even the ſtarven Pagans. The Lord of the harveſt thruſt out many more gracious labourers into that field, and abundantly bleſſe their endeavours. It were good that all our weapons of warre, too much exerciſed one upon another, were all turned into inſtruments of peace, for doing our Lord this and the like much more happy ſervice.

M. COTTONS *doctrine may prove a great marre to that happy work.*

That M. *Cotton* brings from *Revel.* 15. 8. to perſwade, that no conſiderable number of Pagans or others, can be converted to Chriſt, till the time that Antichriſt be ruined, and the Jewes converted, I do much miſlike; as both a groundleſſe and exceeding unſeaſonable fancie, too ape, if not guarded againſt, to diſcourage and cool the moſt laudable fit of zeal, that God has lately wakened in the breſts of many gracious brethren towards that moſt pious work.

Certainly

Certainly M. *Williams* in his laſt peece catches it greedily, and makes it one of his main grounds to hinder all conſiderable endeavours for bringing into the Church of Chriſt and Temple, either Jewes or Gentiles, or ignorant Chriſtians, till that ſmoak M. *Cotton* points at be vaniſhed, and after the Antichriſts fall and the Jewes reſurrection, M. *Williams* Apoſtolique times be returned. I have oft pitied that poor mans ſpirit, and have thought him fitted with many good endowments for eminent ſervice to Chriſt, had not evill principles put him out of the right way: but as long agoe his errors were many and terrible, ſome conſequential to his firſt *Browniſme*, others to his next *Anabaptiſme*, and others to his preſent woful ſeekings ſo his diverſion from improving of his talent among the *Americans*, I conceive it in a great part to have iſſued from his grounds of Independency, and ſome other miſconceits on the *Revelation*, eſpecially this in hand which he learned while he was in ſociety with M. *Cotton*, and yet does retain without any change in theſe points.

SECT. XVIII. & XIX.

How the hereſies of *New-England* were cured.

IN theſe two Sections M. C. takes to conſideration what I objected of the fearful hereſies and other evils which attended Independency in *New England*. This is one of the moſt material paſſages of my book, and as I conceive M. *Cottons* anſwer to it is large alſo unſatisfactory as to any paſſage of the whole. Hereof I am ſo confident, that without a reply, I refer the judgement to any Readers diſcretion, who will be at the pains to compare our Writings. Only what is obſerved, that the greater and worſe the errors of *New England* were, the praiſe of Independency which cured them, muſt be the greater; let it be ſo, if two limitations do not ſpoile this Sophiſme; Firſt the evils did ariſe, at leaſt were ſoſtered and increaſed by Independency, as much as the parallel evils were by *Browniſme*. Secondly, any cure that was, came not by Independency, but by that which Independents had borrowed from the reformed Churches; the power of doctrine, the authority of a Synod, the diligent concurrence of a Chriſtian Magiſtrate: what is proper to Independency, was the great impediment of theſe medicines genuine operation.

Independency did never cure but to this day, greatly marre the cure of the hereſies of New-England.

That the doctrine of ſingle Paſtors did neither ſtop the riſe, nor bring down the reign of theſe hereſies, came from this, that their ſtrength was to long in being combined in an ordinary Claſſe and Synod; and when they had met in their Synod, the main marre of their labour was the common error of Independency: the dint of the divine authority, was kept off the conſcience of all the erring perſons, by their falſ belief, that themſelves in their corrupt elderſhips and congregations, were Chriſts ſupream Courts on earth; not any of them more ſubordinate and ſubject to the Synod, then the Synod was to any of them. Hence it was, that when the ſtrength of the Synod was ſpent, and it had done the uttermoſt which their Independent principles permitted them, the evil was ſo far from being cured, ſafely, ſpeedily, and effectually (as M. *Cotton* does ſpeak) that it remained ſtill in its full ſtrength; and if the Magiſtrate had not put to his hand, to do that which in ſpirituall matters, many of the congregational way do now tell us is a plain uſurpation, and a ſtretching beyond the line of the Magiſtrate, even unto a *Themachie*, their

consultative Synod had been (as they tell us) for little purpose: yet, when they and the Magistrate both had done what they could in their way, they were far from the curing of that rooted evil: It has raged since in *New Plimuth* as much as ever; as also in divers places of their far plantations without the patent of the Bay, whether the infected persons did retire. Yea, to our woful experience, and the great lamentation of all gracious persons of what ever mind in the three dominions, we have seen the fire which in *New-England* was but sprinkled with some Presbyterian water, exceedingly weakned with Independentish ingredients, to have broken up again in old *England* in a most dangerous and devouring flame, which makes havock of all, without the appearance of any possible remedy, till the Lord himself from heaven do stop its violence.

All hopes of union with Independents, have yet ended in disappointments and despaire.

M *Cotton* in his 90. page has one passage which makes me glad, if I understand it right; for there, and in his 72. page also, he seems to me to say, that it is the mind and practice both of himself and the rest in *New England*, to admit to their communion men of Presbyterian, yea of Episcopal principles, who are otherwayes blameless; if so they desire to live peaceably either beside them, or in one congregation with them, whether as constant members, or in passing.

I love not Episcopal principles, neither Independentisme; but I am sure if these of the Independent way in real sincerity agree to this which I conceive here M. *Cotton* does declare for the mind and practice of his brethren in *New England*, it might have been a fair foundation of much love and peace, and prevented much mischief, which of late hath tumbled down upon flourishing navions, most from the evill fountain of our own unhappy discords: But what shall I say, or what hopes shall I conceive of peace, notwithstanding of all the fair appearances, which sometime do drop from the pennes and tongues of eminent men? Yea, such appearances as (in my rash unconsideration) has ofter then once put me to the very gates of a fools paradise, when I remember the Apologetick narration of the dissenting brethren in the Synod of *Westminster*, where they professe liberally enough their readinesse to comply and accommodate with all gracious brethren, offering to them a liberty to enjoy peaceably any not fundamental error; yea in their congregations and familiar society they embrace without the least note of censure, many far more differing from them, then we of the Synod did: notwithstanding all these fair words of accommodating with others, when ever it came to the point of actual joyning with us, *I* did never see, nor as *I* remember, ever heard that any of them would be induced either to be officer or member in any of our best ruled congregations; but when it comes to the issue, they ever peremptorily required, and perpetually practised a gathering of Churches out of our Churches, a real dissolution of all the reformed Churches in the world so far as they had power, that handfuls of picked congregations in the way of the Separatists might be set up in their places.

If M. *Cotton* and his brethren about him would be pleased to clear and make practicable, what here he speaks of joyning with Presbyterians and other reformed Churches, so that the world might see it were not words, but a real and cordial assurance, that they minded not the dissolution of our Churches, nor any separation from us, but only that they desired us to keep from the Lords Table ignorant and scandalous persons, and to practise our Presbyterial government according to Gospel rules; if this were made sure, I know it would clear many misapprehensions, and be a fair beginning of a long desired concord. But while the Lords indignation be over, I have

have no hopes of any accommodation among any, but I am filled with fear of the progresse of rents, and increase of cursed divisions.

SECT. XX.

Concerning the more effectual proceedings of Presbyterians against errors then *Independents* have used, or by their principles can use.

IN the twenty Section of this so long a Chapter, M. *Cotton* he puts me to answer what better or other remedy the Presbyterian discipline could have used against the like heresies, then the Congationals in *New England* did practise? I answer, that no discipline, where the Lord in anger retires his power, is able to cure the smallest emergent enormity in any Church; but withall it is evident, that whereever in the Lords mercy the Presbyterian discipline has gotten leave without impediment, to put forth its vertue, it has taken a much better and readier way with all contingent evils, then Independency where it prevailes, can permit to be used. The Churches of *France* and *Scotland* have been tried with the beginnings of dangerous both heresies and schismes; but by the blessing of God on their Classical government, they took always so quick courses therewith, that such wofull confusions as these of *New-England* were never heard of among them: sometimes indeed the discountenance of the Magistrate, marring the Churches to exercise their discipline, did put them in hazard of great enough misorder; but when the Lord removed that crosse of the Magistrates disfavour, the forenamed Churches making use of the divine ordinance of Presbytery, came alwayes to a quick end of their distempers. That thus it has been in by-gone times, undeniable experience puts it out of question. To declare the wayes which gracious divines in these Churches did use to prevent imminent, and to remove incumbent evils, would require a far wiser and more comprehending head then mine. Only to that which M. *Cotton* objects, as it were against the possibility, at least probability of any better proceeding among Presbyterians, then were these of the congregationals in *New-England*, I offer what for the time comes to my thoughts.

The Presbytery in by-gone time has proceeded in a farre better and more successfull way then Independency *against heresie, and every emergent evill.*

The first question is, if Presbyterial government in *New England* would have hindred the reception of all these heretick and erroneous persons within the Church? To this M. *Cotton* answers, That Presbyterians excluding from the Church no member of the Commonwealth, would have admitted them all. But M. *Cotton* might have known that this was far from our way; we maintain that it should be our care and study to have all the members of the Commonwealth so qualified, that they might be admitted to Church-fellowship, as it was ever in *Israel*: but withall, if our labour prevail not to get them so rightly qualified, we teach that it is our duty to hold them out, even all scandalous and grossely ignorant persons, at their first offer to enter, and to cast them out when they have crept in, if they will remain such; as for heretical and erroneous persons, we have confessions of faith and covenants under sollemn oathes and subscriptions, whereby we keep these off from entring, and purge them out if entred: this is the avowed way of Presbyterians, when we come short of its practice,

Presbyterians take not all the members of the Commonwealth into the bosome of the Church.

ctice, it shall be our acknowledged infirmity, but not our defended error.

The second question is, what we could have done with hereticks who denied their heresie, and it could not be proved against them by two witnesses? *Answ.* Our way in such cases is this; if a person fall under the suspicion of heresie, the minister presently deals with him in private; if he give no satisfaction, and the slander grow, the minister calls him before the congregational eldership, that he may clear himself of the errors imputed to him: if for all this the suspicion remain, the person under slander must clear himself by his oath from the alledged error, or subscribe the contrary truth, and promise to abstain from the company of all who are known to be guilty of these errors: if the congregational eldership be negligent in their duty, the party suspected is called immediately before the Classical Presbytery, to perform there all we spoke of; if they refuse to answer and obey, after a convenient time of a meek and wise dealing with them, they are excommunicated, the rest of the Church members are discharged to keep fellowship with them. If this or the like course had been taken with the hereticks of *New England*, the leaven of a few had not so quickly infected almost the whole lump.

Deniers of flagrant slanders would be put to oathes, subscriptions, and inhibitions.

The third question, when a Congregational eldership is suspected to be remisse in doing their duty, what can be done more then to call a Synod, or to cognosce upon the alledged errors, and to exhort particular congregations to censure erroneous persons? *Answ.* The Presbyterian discipline does oblige to much more then all this; it has a standing Classis, which is not to be gathered upon the occasion of a congregations negligence, but does meet weekly to see that there be no neglect; and if any be found, they do not only exhort the negligent to amend, but immediately they cite the person under slander to answer before the Classis: and if the Classis be negligent, there is a standing Synod, which meets at a knowne time, once at least in the half year, which cites offensive persons, whom the congregational and classical elderships have overseen: There is also a standing general Assembly which once a year or oster, sees to all neglected scandals of life or doctrine in the whole land, and in the negligence of other inferiour Judicatories, takes immediate course with them it self.

The excellency of the discipline of the reformed Churches beyond that of the Independents.

Occasionall assemblies before they can meet, the country may be infected so farre, that the time of cure may be past; and when they meet for meer advice, only to intreat a corrupt eldership to censure their corrupting pastor, or any infected people to depose their seducing elders, all their labour may be to little purpose; as the Synod of *New-England* found it in the case of *Wheelwright*. Though the Magistrate did banish him, yet the Church could not censure him, nor can they censure any erroneous person who has gotten a pluralitie of a small congregation infected, unlesse it be by the new invented censure of Non-communion, wherewith any one heretique can censure the whole Church universall, as well as any Orthodox Oecumenick Synod can censure him alone.

The discipline of New England, *very defective.*

We are misinformed, if divers of the brethren of *New England*, have not found in their own experience so sensible defects here in their discipline, that they are not so averse as sometimes to have it reformed. What an happinesse had it been both for the *English* and *Scottish* Nation, if Synods had been ordinary in *New England*; and persons obstinate in these very errors, which the state lawes had condemned, after all necessary dealing, had been by them excommunicate? such a Synodick censure upon the head

of

of many damnable heretiques, which their owne congregations ſpared till they had conveyed themſelves back to old *England*, might have made them uncapable to have acted much of the evill already perpetuated by them, and like now to be continued by many of their ſeduced diſciples.

CHAP. IV.

Of the noveltie of *Independency*.

THe following Chapters of M. *Cotton* are not oppoſite to any particular paſſages of my book, if you except a few by-words, but fall upon diſcourſes of the Antiquitie and fruits of congregationall government, which concerne not me to meddle with: yet ſince they are profeſſed to be againſt my writing, I ſhall take ſome ſhort ſurvey of them.

How Independency is Browniſme, *and yet different from it.*

Upon what grounds *I* make *Independency* reall *Browniſme*, and yet a way by it ſelf, brought downe by M. *Robinſon* to that which the parties themſelves call a Semi, but *I* a Seſqui-ſeparation, I have ſhewed in ſundry places of my book; which if Mr. *Cotton* will take leſſure to examine, he ſhall have my things for it.

That our Claſſicall Presbiteries and Synods are no more ancient then humane epiſcopacy, M. *Cotton* will be content that we ſuſpend our beleif hereof till in his doctrinall part he have made this out againſt all the reformed, a little better then the Separatiſts before him, the only authors of that tenet, have yet been able to doe.

That *Independency* was inſtitute by Chriſt Matth. 18. and 1 Cor. 5. is promiſed to be proved in the examination of what *I* bring from ſcripture to the contrary. *I* ſhall wait on to ſee this promiſe performed.

Synods not extrinſecall to congregations.

What is brought here againſt the power of Synods over abſent congregations, is but a miſtated queſtion: for M. *Cotton* knows that Presbyterians doe not grant the abſence of congregations from a Synod, when their deputies and repreſentatives ſit there, in ſuch a convenient number as the congregations have agreed unto: The Synod is not any extrinſecall and heterogeneous but an intrinſecall and homogeneous power to all the ſubordinate congregations, of whoſe Miniſters and elders alone it does conſiſt.

What M. *Cotton* here intends to prove, that the meeting at *Jeruſalem* is no paterne for the power and juriſdiction of ſuch Synods as all the ancient and all the reformed Churches have practiſed is the very tenet of the Separatiſts againſt the minde and practiſe of all other Chriſtians of old and late; wherein none *I* know joyne with them but the *Belgick Arminians*; and that but after their deſpaire of Synods, as we may ſee by *Vedelius Rapſodius* in his head *De Synodis*.

The Synod of Jeruſalem *a pattern of ſet Synods as well as of occaſionall.*

The firſt difference which M. *Cotton* brings betwixt the Synod at *Jeruſalem* and ours, is, that it was only occaſionall, on the accident of the diſſention at *Antioch*, while as ours are ſet and ordinary. *Anſw.* M. *Cotton* himſelf grants that beſide diſſention any male-adminiſtration in any particular Church which hinders the progreſſe of the goſpell, may occaſion the call of a Synod. As theſe two emergents gave good and divine ground for calling of a Synod, ſo the like occaſions of curing evill, and furthering good in particular congregations by mutual help, falling

out

out frequently and ordinarily, makes a divine right to all frequent and ordinary Synods, according to *M. Cottons* owne grounds.

M. Cottons *new rule of Synods destroyes the Synod of* Jerusalem.

But M. *Cotton* here findes out a new rule & a new divine prescripion from Revel. 2. in case of male administration or any other evill emergent in a congregation; that letters be written by neighbouring elders for the cure of these evils, and no Synod be called till on refusall of neighbourly admonition a necessary occasion for calling a Synod doe appear. See whether prettie fine conceptions will lead good men! This new rule strikes at the root not only of the Synods of *New-England* and *Arnhem* (the only two which *Independents* have enjoyed to this day) but it everts the Synod of *Jerusalem* it self. Were the Churches of *Antioch*, *Boston* & *Arnhem* (in which the evils occasioning the Synods did arise) admonished by letters from neighbour congregations, and did they refuse the admonitions they got, that upon their obstinacy, the necessitie of calling a Synod became evident to all the vicinities; is this solid and very certaine divinitie?

M Cotton *everts Independent Synods.*

The second difference betwixt *Jerusalems* Synod and ours, which M. *Cotton* urges, is, that in the one the whole Church were constituent & determinating members, in the other only the elders. *Answ.* I would know of M. *Cotton*, if he will stand to this *Brownistick* & *Arminian* way of assemblies, what he can say for the Synod of *New England*; were all the Chrches there or any one whole Church constituent members of that Synod? did any voice with the elders but such as were deligate and had their particular commissions? Does M. *Cotton* think that all the thousands, yea the *Myriads* that were members of the Church at *Jerusalem*, could sit and voice with the Apostles in that Synod in one private roome? for a publique they had none; this will be a fine way to annul that one Synod, which *New England* to its great good enjoyed, and to prevent the being of any more in any time coming.

M. Cotton *everts Ancient Synods.*

The third difference is, that the Synod of *Jerusalem* did only declare, but ours doe also censure. *Answ.* Did not M. *Cotton* consider that the Synod of *Jerusalem* could not justly censure having found no transgression of any of their appointments? and to have appointed censures upon the supposall of transgression, had not at all been fitting for them. However it appears that *M. Cotton* lays downe a fair ground, that the most flagitious and seditious heretiques shall be put in safetie for ever from all hazard of any censure. The hereticall pastors owne little flock, for the pluralitie suppose them to be seduced, as it was in *M. Wheel-wrights* case, all the world beside has no jurisdiction over him: The censures which were inflicted on *Arrius*, *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, by the ancient Councells, on the *Arminians* by the Synod of *Dort*, to M. *Cotton* are all unjust usurpations.

The Apostles in the Synod of Jerusalem left an imitable paterne.

The fourth difference is, That the Synod of *Jerusalem* had the personal presence of infallible guides. *Answ.* How oft have the *Brownists* been told that the Apostles in that Synod, for the exampl of other Synods hereafter, did proceed in a way of rationale debate, making deductions from the grounds of scripture towards the questions in hand, not making use for the time of immediate inspirations wherein they were not imitable by ordinary officers in after-ages; to whom yet M. *Cotton* makes them in diverse cases a paterne.

SECT.

SECT. II.

M. Cotton often M. Can the Browniſt throwes the Magdeburgicks to ſpeak againſt their owne mind and words.

IN this ſection M. *Cotton* brings a paſſage from the *Magdeburgicks*, that in the ſecond Century, ſingle congregations had all their juriſdiction ſo within themſelves, that no Claſſes nor Synod did exerciſe any part of it. *Anſw.* 1. This teſtimony M. *Can* the *Browniſt* makes great noyſe of before M. *Cotton*. But I thought by that which M. *Cotton* had anſwered at firſt to it, M. *Cotton* might have been pleaſed once to have looked upon the authors themſelves, who in that ſame very paſſage contradict the error which M. *Can* and M. *Cotton* will have them to defend: to wit, that Synods of delegates from many Churches, had that power which ordinarily when they exerciſed in condemning of errors, and cenſuring even to excommunication heretical perſons. *Conveniebant vel omnes provinciales, vel plerique doctores, hæreſinque reprobantes Eccleſia, rejiciebant & excommunicabant.* That this excommunication of hereſies is underſtood by the Centuriſts of heretical perſons, appeares expreſſely in M. *Cotton*'s next citation out of theſe authours.

The Church of Rome of old not congregationall.

Secondly, theſe ſingle Churches whereof the Centuriſts ſpeak, were the Churches of *Rome*, *Carthage*, *Antioch*, *Jeruſalem* and the like, which in the Apoſtles dayes were not congregational but claſſical, much more in the ſecond Century. Can M. *Cotton* obtain from his own mind to believe that the Church of *Rome* under the governments of *Cornelius* towards the two hundred forty and third year, was but one congregation, which uſually in one private room, did go about reverently and orderly all the Ordinances of God, as well Sacraments and diſcipline, as the Word and doctrine? Publick places then had they none, and their private crypts in that time of hot perſecution were but narrow. How will M. *Cotton* get the labours of forty four Preachers handſomely beſtowed within the bounds of one private room? That in thoſe dayes, not only Presbyters, but Diaconi alſo were ordinary Preachers, M. *Cotton* I think will not queſtion: what corner of that private houſe was able to contain the very poor who lived upon the Churches alms, being *mille quingenti?* and though a place might be found for *tanta multitudo miniſtrorum*, and *tantus numerus egentium*, as *Cornelius* ſpeaks of in his letter, Euſeb. 6. 35. yet where will M. *Cotton* beſtow the body of the people, *maximam & innumerabilem populi frequentiam?* if M. *Cotton* can obtain of his own ingenuity to believe ſuch monſtrous impoſſibilities, yet I hope he will pardon the reſt of the world for their unability to follow him therein.

SECT. III.

Mr. Cotton with Mr. Can, condemns all the Oecumenick Councells.

IN this Section M. *Cotton* offers to prove from another teſtimony of the *Magdeburgicks*, (as M. *Can* did before him) That in the third Century the government of the Church was congregational, as well as in the ſecond. *Anſw.* This may well be true, and yet no congregational way might then be known in the world. Surely in the very place cited here by M. *Cotton*, the Centuriſts

turists make it an ordinary cause for Provincial Synods to ordain, to depose, and to excommunicate: M. *Cotton* acknowledges this in two causes, and reproves it. But why does he not acknowledge it in many more? and how is it that M. *Cotton* and his friends should be the first, who reprove the Oecumenick Councell of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus* and the rest, for censuring *Arrius*, *Nestorius*, *Macedonius*, and such arch-hereticks? Is this well done by men of their modesty and learning? have they the point of any footstep before them in this boldnesse? if you except *Servetus*, *Socinus*, and such infamous *Anti-trinitarians*.

Cyprian no Independent.

Also why does M *Cotton*, so much labour to make *Cyprian* an Independent, and his rule congregational? was the people of *Carthage* all pinned up in one congregation? though the number of Christians was not so great then at *Carthage* as in *Rome*, yet were there not so many Christians then in *Carthage*, and so many Church-officers, that a good many private roomes would not have accommodated them in their religious services? In these very places cited out of *Cyprian* it is clear, that a Synod of *Carthage* did excommunicate the *Roman* messengers of *Novatian*, when *Cyprian* was present, and President; as a *Roman* Synod a little before had excommunicated the first and arch-schismatick that ever was in *Rome*, *Novatus*, fugitive from *Carthage*, and that with *Cyprian's* applause, though M. *Cotton* condemn the deed. Yea in these places cited by M. *Cotton* out of the *Magdeburgicks* and *Cyprian*, it appears, that ordination was usually performed in particular Churches, such as *Rome*, *Antioch*, *Carthage*, and the rest, which were classical, and alwayes with the consent of that portion of the people which was willing to attend the meeting of the Elders, yet without any prejudice to the peoples liberty; The Synods of the bounds did frequently ordain, as they did execute other parts of Ecclesiastick jurisdiction. The truth of these practises may be seen in the places brought by M. *Can*, and M. *Cotton* for the contrary. As for the right of these actions, when M. *Cotton* shall be pleased (according to his promise) to answer what I have brought already to clear it, then will it be time for me to think on a reply.

CHAP. V.

Of the fruits of *Independency* in any by-gone time.

SECT. I.

MAster *Cotton* laying down for a ground, that the government of the first three Centuries was congregational, he makes all the good fruits of Christians in these ages to grow upon the tree of Independency. *Answ.* M. *Cotton* might have enlarged himself upon the excellent good works of Christians in these golden times, so much as he pleased, without any mans contradiction, till he came to the applications; and here that we cannot grant, upon his bare supposition without any proof, that the discipline of Christians in these ancient times was truly Independency; and must crave M. *Cottons* favour and permission, till it be better proved.

SECT.

SECT. II.

WHat here is brought of the good fruits of Independency in *New England*, I will not ſtand to examine; for my own part, I wiſh that much grace and peace may increaſe there: But what ever good has been or ſhall be in *New England*, I take it to have another root then that of Independency: yea, if that weed were plucked up from among them, I am ſo charitable as to hope that their good fruits would quickly much increaſe, and their evill diminiſh.

SECT. III.

FOr the good fruits that old *England* hath yet paſſed of the plant of Independency, I ſhall ſay no more, but that poſterity, a more impartial Judge of what paſſes among us then this preſent age, and the world abroad, leſſe intereſſed then we the agents and patients upon the place, will give out the ſentence.

A *POSTSCRIPT*.

Concerning Mr. *Cottons* late Treatiſe of the holineſſe of Church-members.

I count Mr. COTTONS *writing againſt me an honour and favour.*

WHen I had written thus farre and not before, M. *Cottons* Treatiſe of the holineſſe of Church-members fell in mine hands: In it I find much paper ſpent againſt another ſheet of the firſt part of my *Diſſwaſive*, for which truly I am glad and give thanks: for when ever any of my writings are taken by that Reverend Divine to his ſo ſerious conſideration, as to reply to them in print, I do and ſhall acknowledge it an obligation.

Why I do not reply to M. COTTON.

I count it needleſſe at this time to rejoyn to that which concerns my part in that book, the moſt and chief parts of it belonging to M *Rutherford*: I doubt not but in convenient time he ſhall give ſuch ſatisfaction to what either M. *Hooker* or M. *Cotton* has replied to his arguments, that I ſhall need to ſay no more in that cauſe; only on my firſt ſight of that Treatiſe, theſe few notes did occurre.

Mr. COTTONS *ſtating of the queſtion, agrees the controverſie.*

1. That M. *Cotton* in his 5. Sect. of his 1. cap. pag. 20, 21, 22. does ſo ſtate the queſtion betwixt the Presbyterians and the Independents, in the great, and that which I uſe to count the greateſt head of their difference, that their needs be no diſcord all, but a full concordance may be had in this main controverſie, upon ſuch a ſtating of the queſtion; for all that M. *Cotton* ſeems to require in a Church member, is no more then that which is the profeſſed doctrine and practice of the Church of *Scotland* and as I think of *Holland* and *France*, and other reformed Churches: to wit, that younger ones baptized in the Church, before they be admitted to the Lords Table be publickly examined, and give ſatisfaction in

their knowledge of the grounds of Religion, and in their freedom from all scandal, in their willingnesse to submit themselves to all the discipline of Christ. The second thing which he does require is, that after admission to the Lords Table, when in posterior trials any are found to be grossely ignorant or scandalous, and obstinate in their ignorance or scandal, that in Christs meek and prudent order they be kept from the holy Table, and if this first degree of censure amend them not, that at last they be excommunicated. Did any Presbyterian ever deny any of these things, or when their practice came not up to their profession, did they ever defend their sinful negligence? if no more were required in this head, that great controversie were at a good end.

Mr. Cotton for all his seeming aggreeance yet really differeth from us.

But secondly, I observe that however in stating the question, and here and there debating of it, M. *Cotton* brings us to a real agreeance, and makes the difference to be in that wherein we really do not contradict him; yet in the prosecution he seems oft to fall back into the old and true controversie, affirming that all the true members of the visible Church, must be not onely *jure* but *facto* so men, so far as they can judge, truely regenerate persons: that in charitable discretion, which is our Christian apprehension, every member of the Church must not only be effectually wrought upon by the spirit of God in divers common gifts, but also be truly elected, regenerate and sanctified, so far as their Pastors and fellow-members can charitably discern, or ought to judge. Was there ever in this point betwixt the *Brownists* and us, any other difference, but that they did require reall sanctity and grace, not onely *jure* but *facto*, to the apprehension of these whom it concerned to cognoisce upon them? while their Opposites were content with knowledge, profession and want of scandal; for faction; never questioning the *Jus* and obligation of all to grace and holinesse, most reall and sincere: onely the certain possession of this true grace was questioned, which the Separatists avowed was even to be sought after in all members of the visible Church, and necessarily to be found in them all, *in* the charitable discretion of them whose part it was to try it. Their Opposites, that true and sincere grace was not only not to be found in many true members of the visible Church, which M. *Cotton* grants; but that the tryers of these members were not obliged in any discretion to pronounce all and every one of them be truly gracious, unlesse an obligation lay on the tryers of the state of Church-members, to pronounce all truly and sincerely regenerate, holy and elect, in the judgement of charity, whom they found fair professors, free of all censurable ignorance and scandal. This indeed would agree the controversies, and this sometimes both M. *Cotton* and M. *Hooker* seem to import, is their true and only mind: however as M. *Cotton* professes of us, I avow of them, that I do not satisfy my self for all that yet I have read or seen of their judgement in the state of this controversy. For sundry passages of their writings seem to import a full agreeance with us; but divers other passages seem as clearly to make them differ from us, full as much as did ever any of the *Brownists*; yea, and much more also. It were a pity but this matter were better cleared, and that for mistakes of expressions, there were no difference among brethren who professe oft an earnest desire of concord, so far as it is possible.

M. Cotton still highly for separation from all Presbyterian Churches.

My third note is, that M. *Cotton* comes up openly and clearly to the uttermost of all that I alledged on him or his friends; even to that which I called a Sequi separation, to a true separation for conscience sake, from the best

best reformed Churches this day in Europe. It is my charitable judgement, on some experience had of the people at *Boston* in passing that way, and of my three yeares familiar conversing in the assembly at Westminster with the learned and gracious pastor of that towne Dr. *Tuckny*. (by the testimony also I finde in the same dedicatory given to that people, it seems *M. Cotton* in this is in my judgement) that the Church of *Boston* is one of the best reformed congregations in all *England*, or anywhere else of our Presbyterian way. Notwithstanding *M. Coton* avowes a necessity lying on his conscience, not to dare for the terrors of God to joyne with that Church; and that for two impediments alone, which he counts common to all the Presbyterians in the world. It is no Salvo at all to me, but rather a making of his schisme worse, that he will not have his refusing to joyne with such a Church as *Boston*, to be called any separation, and that he will not condemne any, whose larger consciences permit them to joyne. These and such other mitigations help nothing at all: for the better the Church is with which you cannot joyne, the fewer and smaller the causes are of your not joynings; the schisme becomes the worse and the more sinfull.

When *M. Cotton* professes Christ to be the author, the gatherer, the planter of that Independent separate congregation, which upon such grounds of conscience as here he avowes to necessitate them not to joyne with the old Presbyterian congregation there, it is clear to me that he allowes, and avowes here his allowance of gathering Independent Churches out of the best Presbyterian Churches in *England*, or in the world; and that all the members of these new modelled Churches, ought to be allowed after *M. Cottons* doctrine and practice, to avow that in the conviction of their conscience from the terrors of God they cannot live as officers or members in any of the best reformed Presbyterian congregations; and that in his and their judgement all the Presbyterian congregations ought to be dissolved, that they may be put in a better frame, though they can allow others to be in a different judgment.

Mr. Cotton does say, but not prove, that I mistate the question.

My fourth note is, that what *M. Cotton* makes my mistake in setting downe the state of the question, seemes yet to me to be no mistake at all: for first, my stating and debating of the question is really the same with *M. Rutherford* and others in whom he makes no such mistake. Secondly, that which I said for clearing of the state of the question, I proved it by divers from all testimonies of the chief of the Independent party, to which *M. Cotton* does offer no answer. Thirdly, the maine things I put in the state of the question, *M. Cotton* in this very book does justifie. For the first, that beside profession, knowledge, and want of scandal, which Presbyterians require in Church-members, Independents doe adde true and sincere grace, *M. Cotton* is very expresse along all his book (so farre as concernes the judgement and true apprehension of all whom the triall of that matter does concerne) as for the certaintie of true grace in the persones tryed, no *Brownist* was ever alledged to defend it.

What secondly I said of their requiring evident convincing and satisfactory signes of true grace, *M. Cotton* (I conceive) does not deny it of officers; for upon what else shall their charitable discerning of true grace be founded, but on clear, convincing signes, satisfactory to their owne judgement, in that which they judge?

What thirdly I put in the question, concerned the peoples satisfaction in the true grace of all to be admitted: *M. Cotton* is clear enough in the power of liberty for the people, as well as the Officers in admitting of members, yea of the peoples interest in admission and casting forth, as far as I alledged.

As for the fourth point which I put in the queſtion, the neceſſity, at leaſt expediency of ſeparations from Churches conſtitute in any another way, I made it but a leſs principal ingredient in the controverſie, as my arguments in the debate do clear; however, be it as it will, M. *Cotton* here abundantly juſtifies it, as appears in my former obſervations.

Mr. COTTON *is more ready and eager, then ſucceſſefull in catching my contradictions.*

My fift note, is, that M. *Cotton* is very ready (in a way tart enough) to catch my contradictions, where there is, as I conceive, but ſmall cauſe: of this kind I offer now but three inſtances, to his own review. Firſt, in his page 50, 51. I had ſaid that his argument did drive to the error of *Arminius*, the Apoſtaſie of the Saints; which how well is yet cleared, I do not here debate; only ſtill he avowes, that all the members of a viſible Church, many whereof unqueſtionably go to hell, are to be reputed truly juſtified, ſanctified, and eternally elected to grace and glory. I ſaid it drove farther to the error of *Socinus*, who aſcribed the converſion of ſoules to the preaching of private men only, who had no Paſtoral charge; or if to Paſtors, yet to them not as Paſtors, but as private gifted men: I ſaid alſo that his argument drove to a farther error then what either *Arminius* or *Socinus* did maintain; even to this, that all converſion of ſoules was performed without the Church, ſince all within the Church were ſuppoſed by him to be really converted before their entry, at leaſt before their admiſſion to the Lords Table. How M. *Cotton* looſes theſe knots, I do not here enquire; for all that I point at in this place is, the ſore cenſure he is pleaſed to put upon the way of my reaſoning; he pronounces me tranſported with the heat of diſputation, he avowes that I and my party, the Presbyterians being ready for ought he knowes to receive all into the boſome of our Churches, whom the Independents refuſe, have more communion with *Arminius* and *Socinus* then they: It is ſtrange to him that I ſhould ſay they learned their tenets from *Socinus*, while yet I profeſſe I know not if *Socinus* or any of his followers did ever maintain ſuch tenets: how tranſported ſoever I had been, yet the meaſure ſeems hard for my ſake to have caſt ſo deep reflexions on the reformed Churches, as having any communion with *Arminius* and *Socinus*, and as being ready to receive all whom the Independents refuſe: the matter here (ſo far as I know) being utterly falſe, as M. *Cotton* loves to ſpeak: alſo the fathering on me ſo flat a contradiction, where there was no appearance of any, whence can it be proved? The tenet which I ſaid they borrowed from, I meant they followed the *Socinians* in; to wit, converſion by the preaching of private men; and the tenet, which I ſaid I knew not if any *Socinian* maintained; to wit, the converſion of men only without the Church, and of none within the Church, ſo far as Chriſtian judgement and apprehenſion could extend, not being the ſame, but clearly diſtinct tenets and different propoſitions, and ſo having no ſhew of any contradiction.

Secondly, M. *Cotton* pag. 41. makes me again tranſported with the heat of diſputation, and will have me by the hand of God put on to oppoſe my ſelf as well as my adverſary. Now for what is this terrible cenſure? I ſaid that the concluſion of the Independents to admit to Church-membership, none but theſe who were judged to be real Saints, did not concern the reformed Churches, and yet did tend to diſturb the matter in my words, and open ſenſe, clearly true, as many then conceived, and now ſee it with their eyes. The caſe of admiſſion of members, might well concern *America* and *New England*, where new Churches were erected of ſtrangers, and new-come-in paſſengers, but formally and rationally this caſe did not concern any of the reformed Churches in Europe, where the Churches were conſtituted, and not new to

be

be gathered and erected, as in *New-England*. Notwithstanding this debate was so managed by the Independents, that really, virtually, visibly, and palpably it tendeth to the dissolution of all the reformed, importing their vitious constitution, and a necessity of gathering new Churches out of them, and after the Independent model: also the conscientious expediency for all on whom are the terrors of God, to abstain from membership in any, even the best of them. Is there here any so grosse contradiction, that in it a transportation of mind, and a divine hand inflicting a judicial blindnesse to oppose my self as well my adversaries, does appear? what needed such a censure?

Thirdly, M. *Cotton* in his 45. page notes me the third time, as a man transported with the heat of contention and misguided zeal, as ascribing not only that which was not his, but which I knew was not his; and for what is this high censure, and falshood so peremptorily fastened upon me? In one place I say, that M. *Cotton* affirmes every member of a visible Church is in truth and sincerity a beleiver and Saint; but in another place I say, that M. *Cotton* affirmes every member of each Church is in sincerity to be a Saint and beleiver. The first speaks, sayes M. *Cotton de facto*, the second *de jure*, betwixt which there is a vaste difference; to this I have spoken before; only now I adde, that M. *Cotton* contracts and makes narrower the vastnesse of this difference; according to his distinction I understood the second as well as the first, onely *de facto*; for as he grants, neither he nor I, nor any made ever question *de jure*; all our question was of that which the members of the Church were, and *in facto* were to be to us, and to be conceived of by all men in their Christian, charitable, and approved judgement.

Mr. COTTONS *new paradoxes.*

My sixth note, that which I brought to prove my main conclusion, is not to my sense here well answered. *I* alledged that Christ and his Apostles the first and best gatherers of the Church in the New Testament, did not at all judge nor conceive in any charity, that all and every one whom they admitted to be members of Churches, were reall and sincere Saints. M. *Cotton* in his answer, slides from the judgement of Christ, which alone was in the argument, to the judgement of the Church, *qua non judicat de occultis*, whereof *I* spoke not: and for the Apostles, particularly *Paul* in his judgement of the *Corinthians*, he will have them to esteem in their charity, real and sincere beleivers, elect, justified and sanctified, these whom they know and publickly avowed to be guilty of open incest, of drunkennesse at the communion, and of fundamental errors: this to me is a needlesse Paradox, since no charity made the Apostles change their judgments of verity they had of the members of the visible Church, grounded upon Christs words and clear Scripture, *That many were called, but few chosen*. That which M. *Cotton* here addes, that the visible Church is a homogeneous part of the Church invisible, and a singular of that universal, as *Socrates* is of *homo*, of the same holinesse, election and grace as is the other, will not (*I* doubt) be approved of all his own party.

My seventh and last remark is, that *I* am not well satisfied with M. *Cottons* impugning the very common maxime of all the Schools, Popish and Protestant, *Theologia Symbolica non est argumentativa*. It seems that this may be one fountain of M. *Cottons* divers mistakes, and if it be not well looked to, may become an occasion in him and others of many further deviations. But *I* break off this Postscript, having insisted beyond my intention, upon that which *I* conceive to be the work of an other man, much my better.

ANIMAD-

ANIMADVERSIONS

upon Mr. TOMBES Addition to his Apologie.

And first

Upon his three preambulatory EPISTLES.

Right Reverend Sir.

M. Tombes has extorted from me this reply.

ALl your Oppositres, M. *Marshall*, M. *Gerce*, M. *Black*, D. *Homes*, M. *Baxter*, and others finding you a man of contention (as you professe your self to be, præcursor. pag. 1.) have been willing to give over further dealing with you, and to let you enjoy that which it seems you must have, the glory of the last word; so I for my part had the same mind. And although your letter to me was carefully conveyed by my Reverend colleague M. *Rutherford*, yet had I resolved not to answer though you should have printed it, as then you threatned, and now have executed your threatning. But while as you are not content with the advantage of this my resolved silence, and for the breaking of it you have entered a complaint against me to my true and lawfull superiors, the provinciall Synod of *Glasgow* and generall assembly of *Scotland*; when thus you force me to speak, if what I say, though truly and modestly spoken, be not very pleasant unto you, you ought to impute no displeasure you may have hereby to me, but your self, who by too great importunitie have extorted it from me.

I am as a lesse in the plea when M. Tombs will be judged by none in the earth.

You commence a complaint against me before two seiled judicatories, a provinciall and generall assembly, to which I am answerable for all the wrongs you complaine of, and who have power over mens cause me to doe you reason, under no lesse paine then deposition from my ministry and excommunication from the Church of Christ. I fear in this you have me at some advantage; for I pray you Sir, to whom may I complaine of your wrongs? civile Judicatories against a minister in Ecclesiastick causes I cannot molest; and before what Ecclesiastick court can I call you? These four market townes, *Lamster*, *Beudly*, *Ledburry*, and *Rosse*, wherein I see at one time you had a ministeriall charge, after your leaving *London*, I doubt if in any of them there be yet erected any ecclesiastick eldership, to which as a member you ought obedience; and although these twentie persones of *Beudly*, brought by your labours to a new baptisme, might possibly be acknowledged by you for such a Church wherunto you would be subject in all Ecclesiastick causes (whereof I much doubt) yet on their part all determination, if I were necessitate to appeal, is there in all *England* no Church judicatory to which you would commit the discussion of my appeal? in this then I am

at a great losse: you have to whom you may thrice a year at least, yea once a week or fortnight, make an addresse for all the wrongs which any minister in *Scotland* has done or shall doe unto you: but *I* would heartily thank you, If ye would informe in what Ecclesiastick court of the world *I* may have the like reason of you.

However, for the better information of my superiors, before they pronounce any sentence against me, for all the wrongs you alledge *I* have done you, *I* offer these Animadversions upon the charge and proofes you have printed to the world against me; let any equitable Judges you will, be but at the paines to read & seriously consider both our allegations, and *I* am not much anxious for the coming forth of their righteous judgments.

M. Tombs *Riddles.* Only *I* think it will be hardly conceiveable, how you can write your self to the nationall assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, a Christian covenanting Presbyterian, and yet in this same paper refuse to acknowledge that assembly for any true Church, but devolve your complaint into their hands, only as being taken for the Church, though truly and to you they had no such capacitie. 2. How by vertue of covenant you are necessitated to preach Anabaptisme and the casting out of the Church all Christians in the Isle of *Brittaine*, yea of the whole world, who adhere to their infant baptisme, till of new after a right and true baptisme they become members of some Anabaptistick congregation: that the solemne league and covenant obliges you to preach such doctrine, few, if any, in *Scotland* doe yet beleive. 3 How you can stand a true covenanted Presbyterian, who yet will not joyne to any congregation in *England*, but of to those whom we call Anabaptists; going on allo to the outmost line of Erastianisme, either abolishing or puting in the hand of a magistrate, all Ecclesiastick discipline; yea putting not only publick preaching but the administration of both Sacraments in the hands of private Christians; and the celebration of baptisme in the hands of men yet unbaptized themselves. How these and many more singularities can be maintained by you, and notwithstanding of all you can be a true covenanted Presbyterian, or as you expresse it better, a Christian Presbyter and covenanter, it will passe the shallownesse of many capacities in *Scotland* to make these things stand well together.

Mr. Tombs *error about the long life of our pamphlets.* In your Epistle to M. *Rutherford*, I think you much mistaken, while you suppose that the pamphlets of this unhappy time, and among the rest yours & mine will ever be looked upon by after ages; Dream not that such papers as ours will so long escape the teeth of the blatts and mothes, the chops of pottingars and baser uses; such high conceits of our writings beseem not our selves unlesse with crowes and apes our owne blood be too beautifull in our eyes, most be cause our owne.

One ground of my patience of M. Ts. maledicency. That in every line (I mean so exceedingly oft) you lay upon me false criminations, it would be factious, unlesse I had perceived that long agoe it had become your ordinary dialect, used without all cause against your adversaries, men of grace, learning, and other respects much my betters: so permitting you the use of that language wherein you have now habituated your self, I shall let it goe, as words evaporating in the aire.

Mr. Tombs *injuriousnesse to Mr.* Rutherfords *Mr.* Edward, *M.* Cotton *and others.* The heavy charge of blowing the bellowes of these warres, which have wasted the whole Isle, I doe not so much wonder that you lay off upon your opposites, as that you should have the modestie to write it to M. *Rutherford*, flouting him so in his face when you have a little flattered him;

For what you here speak of *Edwards*, *Honorius Regius*, and me, in your first Epistle to your patrones, you lay it expressly on your greater opposites, the Assemblies at *Westminster* and *Edinburgh*, in both which M. *Rutherford* was an eminent member, who both in Pulpit and Presse has given as much encouragement for our armed defence against all enemies, Popish, Prelatical, Malignant, and Sectarian, as any Minister in *Brittain*.

Honorius Regius, if he be the *Dutch* Divine he is called, I doubt nothing of his ability to give a good answer for all his actions and writings, to any who pleases to deal with him.

M. *Edwards*, I knew him a most honest man; many have scratched a little the skin of his writings, but to this day (so far as I know) not one has given to any of his Treatises a tolerable sufficient answer.

You name also M. *Cotton*; he indeed did me a greater favour then you have done; for he took of the first part of my *Dissuasive* some leaves to answer, to which in my preceding writing I have given so good satisfaction as I could. But when you would write a Book against the second part of my *Dissuasive*, you are not pleased to meddle with more of it then one page: In all reason might not I have neglected an impugner of so small a point? You seem indeed to import in your præcursor, page 77. that you have prepared an answer to my augmentative part also, but that as yet you could not get it printed. Would not all men have pardoned my silence till that your writing likewise had come out? But since you have forced me to this answer before the time, it is like that put out what you will hereafter, *I* may let it alone to take its hazard without any reply, except you make a second complaint to the Assemblies of *Scotland*; in that cause I cannot say what *I* may be forced to do. But as for M. *Cotton*, it seems you have but a little better opinion of him then of the rest of your opposites. In your præcursor, page 67. for the solid and judicious writing he published against your faith of *Anti pædobaptisme*, you print him as very ridiculous and absurd as if he had avowed, that it was from the devil to presse against the *Anabaptists* and some others, a warrant of every Ordinance from the Word of God; but that it was from God to presse that same ground against Papists and Prelates, M. *Cotton* may reckon with you some day for presenting him on your stage, in such a foolish habit. But leaving your Epistles, *I* come to your criminations.

The first Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombes* excludes all the Infants of Beleevers from the Covenant of Grace, as much as the Infants of *Turks* and *Pagans*.

Mr. Tombs makes himself an unjust censurer of my thoughts

BY way of Preface in the first words you lay upon me a very heavy crime, that *I* made it my businesse not to clear the truth, but to make my adversary odious: such a deep charge should not have been offered without a good proof. And what proof here is possible? who but God and a mans own heart knowes what is in his purpose? what he makes his businesse in his works? The finding of the truth in all my writings, *I* am sure is my reverence before the world, and *I* trust before God my true intention; for making any man odious *I* know *I* should abhorre it more then you professe to abhorre my writings, and the writings of your other adversaries. *Præcurs pag.* 83.

I doe acknowledge I intended over all my Dissuasive to lay out as in a table toge-

ther

ther the whole way of every eminent adversary who occurred, that these who misapprehended what they saw but in parcels, might make a righter judgement of the whole, when they they had it all under their eye together; as you earnestly desired to have done with M. *Baxters* arguments, *praeurs.* p. I verily judged when the ugly face of erroneous mens whole way was clearly and truly portraicted in one board, it would either be repented for by the Authours, or disliked by the followers, beholding clearly the beginning, middle, and end of the whole by-path, wherein they had been misled, as I had done with others, so I dealt with you in one of my pages; drawing together much of your way in your own words, observing in it more singularities then perhaps you were willing should have been taken notice of. But if I may be trusted, my purpose in this was to bring your own heart to grief and repentance before God, for the multitude of your singular deviations; and if this had not been obtained, to have made your person odious to none, but your way to be observed, and so far as my Councell could reach, eschewed also by all.

Sufficient witnesses of my challenge against Mr. Tombes.

The first of your false criminations is, that I made you to spoil all infants of all interest in the Covenant of Grace; for this you cry out on me shame, and many falshoods: But it is good that you cry out, as elsewhere, so in this same place, the like shame and falshood on M. *Marshall*, M. *Vines*, M. *Calamy*, M. *Blake*, and others: I can suffer much in so good company. You put me to that proof of my challenge which you say I made both against you and all other *Anabaptists*: For what I said of you, *I* brought two famous witnesses, M. *Marshall*, and M. *Blake*: you deny not that their testimony was to the full of my allegeance; only in the place of your Apology here cited, you raile upon both my witnesses as false, and upon my self here for using their testimony: you will have my practice no better then if I should have brought *Bellarmines* testimony against *Calvin*, one adversary against another. You might have remembred that adversaries were of divers kinds, some more honest and pious then others, and the matters wherein they are brought to witnesse, were of a different nature. *Bellarmines* testimony against *Calvin* to a Protestant is not of much weight; but *Calvins* testimony against *Bellarmine*, is of greater authority. If M. *Tombes* will give no more credit to Protestants against Papists, then to Papists against Protestants, and will have all that M. *Marshall*, M. *Calamy* and others most grave Divines, much conversant on his writings, do witnesse of his tenets, to be all discredited, as the testimony of false and unsufficient witnesses, because in some questions opposite to him; if this be a part of the worlds new justice, *I* must passe from this proof as unsufficient.

The Anabaptists *put all Infants out of the Covenant of Grace.*

But when this is past from, brought *I* no more to prove that tenet of the *Anabaptists* their putting all the children of Christians out of the Covenant of Grace, as much as the children of *Turks* and *Pagans*? in the very place of my book cited here by you, *I* brought no fewer then ten formal passages out of the prime *Anabaptists*, the first and the most out of the very penners of the late confession: uses any man to back his allegiance with better or more abundant proof? and yet to any one of my ten passages you reply not one word.

Mr. Tombes *puts the Infants of Turks and of Beleevers in the same state, so farre as concerns election, and the Covenant of Grace.*

Only now put all this off your selfe, and deny that ever you wrote any such things, but expressely the contrary; and for this you refer to your Apology, page 64. and 154. When *I* looked upon these places, *I* marvelled much what you could mean, when you deny with passion that ever you or any *Anabaptist* did

write ſuch things, and you cry out upon all your adverſaries to make good that charge againſt you, or to retract it with remorſe for the wrong they had done in charging it upon you: who would think that ſo high a confidence in denial did import your readineſſe to avow poſitively and clearly, that the Covenant of Grace doth belong to ſome *Infants* of believers? Let you or any *Anabaptiſt* ſubſcribe this poſition, and it will end the plea. *I* find a good part of your task is, to make M. *Marſhall* and M. *Blake* to be as much deniers of that poſitive, as you or the *Anabaptiſts* are; but you will not ſay that your ſelf or any *Anabaptiſts* are as much affirmers of that poſition as they.

You bring teſtimonies from *Cyprian* and *Rutherford* to put the *Infants* of *Turks* and *Pagans* in the ſame condition with the *Infants* of Chriſtians, as if both alike were under univerſal grace; but when you ſhould ſpeak out your mind plainly, whether you believe that any Chriſtian *Infant* has any farther right and intereſt in the Covenant of Grace then the *Infants* of *Turks*, you but ſhift and juggle; yet it will not be with you; for behold *I* offer out of the two very places your ſelf here refer to, leaving a multitude of other paſſages, not conſequences, which you will have to be M. *Marſhals* only off-come, but direct teſtimonies whereby you exclude infants of Chriſtians as well as of *Turks* from all intereſt in the Covenant of Grace. I never alledged upon you that you excluded all infants from Election and Salvation, but I granted you made ſome infants both to be elected and ſaved, yet ſo that the infants of *Turks* and *Pagans* were made capable by you of theſe bleſſings as well as the infants of Chriſtians; for although you granted to the infants of Chriſtians a number of advantageous priviledges above theſe who were educated under infidel parents; yet things come near our queſtion; for it alone was of the Covenant of Grace. From this I prove you exclude Chriſtian infants as well as *Turks* from your own words in the places cited, *Examen* page 32. [Concerning Gods election I am not certain any more of the election of a believers infant then an unbelievers; for the covenant or promiſe of grace, I know not that God hath made ſuch a covenant to any, much leſſe to all the natural ſeed of any believing Gentile; I dare not forge ſuch grants] In that ſame place after you have made the infants of *Pagans* and Chriſtians promiſcuouſly and equally ſubject to election, you exclude them all from the covenant and promiſes of grace, till they actually believe; in the former words and theſe following [this *I* dare not ground upon any promiſe of free grace made to the child of a believer as ſuch, for fear leſt *I* incur blaſphemy, challenging a promiſe which God doth not keep] Secondly, in that ſame page when you have reckoned out all the priviledges you can, wherein the infants of believers excell the infants of *Turks* and *Pagans*, you advance not all theſe priviledges to that height as to bring Chriſtian infants at all within the covenant of grace; you will have them at higheſt to be but *in mera potentia* to that priviledge, albeit not ſo remote from it, as *Jewiſh* or *Turkiſh* infants; in theſe words [they are not only as the *Turks* children in *potentia Logica*, or *remota*, but in *potentia propinqua* to believers, and ſaved] Thirdly in that ſame place, after ſome paſſages not very conſiſtent as *I* conceive one with another, you conclude the paragraph with a poſitive aſſertion, that the promiſe of the covenant of grace belongs onely to believers themſelves, and not at all to their ſeed; in the words [that God hath made a promiſe to be the God of believers, and of their ſeed, *I* profeſſe my ignorance of ſuch a promiſe: *I* read of a promiſe made to *Abraham*, that he would be his God, and the God of his ſeed, but *I* am yet to ſeek for that promiſe you ſpeak of to be the God of believers and their ſeed] Fourthly, in the other citation, *Apolog. pag.* 64. you avow that to the infants of believers, there is no promiſe made but general, indefinite, and conditional; ſuch as imports not grace, but other benefits;

benefits; and if grace, then but upon the condition and suppoſition of faith, whereof infants are not capable; in theſe words [*I* ſay, they have promiſes, though general, indefinite and conditional; and *I* mean by general and indefinite, ſuch as determine not the kind of good promiſed, nor the particular perſon, and therefore are true, if performed to any perſon in any ſort of good: and conditional, upon condition of faith and obedience] Fifthly, in the place preceding, you make the covenant of grace and the promiſes thereof to be the peculiar treaſure of the viſible Church, ſo that they cannot be laid hold on by any who are without the viſible Church: Now you make the viſible Church to be defined by profeſſion of faith, and the members thereof to be profeſſors, excluding from the Church and membership therein all infants as unable to make profeſſion of faith; in theſe words, page 65. [Proteſtant writers are wont to define the viſible Church, a number of perſons that profeſſe the faith of Chriſt; now that which makes the viſible Church, makes each member a viſible member, and that is profeſſion; *I* conceive infants are neither in the kingdom of the devil, nor Gods viſible Kingdom, till they declare by their profeſſion, to whom they viſibly belong] Sixthly, you make Baptiſme a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, even when rightly adminiſtred to profeſſors of age, only aptitudinal, and not actual, but to real believers; ſo that God neither by it nor any other way, does ſeal up any promiſe of the new covenant to any infant, nor to any of age who does not actually believe; your page and words do not for the time occurre to me.

Theſe paſſages will not permit you in reaſon to deny that you manifeſtly take away from all infants all intereſt in the covenant of grace: notwithſtanding all who lay any ſuch aſſertion upon you, muſt be falſe accuſers. *I* know theſe four moſt grave and worthy Divines, and much more my ſelf may well miſtake; but falſe accuſations *I* am ſure are very far from us: *I* wiſh from my heart that you and all your friends of the *Anabaptiſts* would grant to the children of believers any true intereſt in the covenant of grace; for ſo one of our greateſt controverſies would be at an end; and moſt gladly ſhould I lay down all accuſing of any of you hereafter for ſuch an error; but naked denials of the aſſertion will not ſatisfie, nor will election be a good enough refuge in this debate.

I hope by this time it appears how far my challenge of the Anabaptiſts in general, and of you in particular for excluding all infants out of the covenant of grace, is from falſhood; you give me five very famous Divines for joynt compurgators of that crime: and though they were all ſilent, *I* have proved my crimination on the other *Anabaptiſts* by ten teſtimonies of their own, and upon you by ſix of your own; if *I* do prove the ſubſequent challenges as well as this firſt, you will not have much cauſe to boaſt of your falſe criminations.

M. Cot. *ſtarting hole ſtopped.*

The ſtarting hole whereby you think to eſcape all, is, that you make many of the Chriſtian infants truly elected; but do you not ſo alſo to the infants of *Turks* and *Pagans*? are not the *Anabaptiſt* confeſſioniſts as clear in the point of election as you? and yet are they hindred by it in moſt expreſs terms to exclude all Chriſtian infants from the covenant of grace, as well as *Pagans*? And in this they ſpeak good reaſon, and very conſequentially to their tenets: for the difference is vaſte betwixt the covenant of grace and election. How many of the elect live long under the covenant of works, true children of wrath as well as others, enemies to God, walking without God in the world, without the promiſes, without hope, till the time of their effectual call? *Paul* while a perſecutor, *Manaſſes* while an idolatrous murtherer, a Warlock; the crucified thief, and many more before their regeneration and repentance, before

their call to any grace, were they under the covenant of grace?

Mr. Tombes *singularity in putting all Infants without the visible Kingdom both of God and the devill.*

To your crimination you add as an *Appendix*, that I wrong you in alledging you taught the uncertainty of the state of infants, and tell that very clearly you had thought the certainty of their election or reprobation. This is a needless crimination; for the words of my challenge carry nothing of election or reprobation. For a little before I had cleared the *Anabaptists* of this imputation; but my expresse words were of your uncertainty, not in the subject but object, even of the thing it self, their being in the kingdom of Satan, or the kingdom of God: And all that there I alledged you here avow, that infants are neither in the visible Kingdom of God, nor in the visible kingdom of the devil. I confesse in this you correct me, that wherein I thought you were uncertain, you here professe your great certainty, which is more and worse then I alledged on you at first; for uncertainty here is evil, but your certainty is worse; and in this you are singular, going beyond the rest of the *Anabaptists*, and all men else I know: for all are wont to take the Church and the world, the visible Kingdom of God, and of Sathan, to be two members of so adequate a division, that whoever is not under the one, does certainly fall to the other; and a midst of abnegation of both, you are the first, as I conceive, who ever professed it.

Howsoever, what I intended to lay to your charge a new tenet beyond other *Anabaptists*, and excluding of all infants both Christian and Pagan, both from the visible Kingdom of God, and the visible kingdome of the devil, till by their profession in ripe years, they declared their inward condition: all this you grant expressly. As for the consequences of your tenet, that many are elected and saved, who were never in any visible Church, either Catholick or particular: That many are reprobate and damned, who were never visible members of Sathans kingdom, or of the world without: The crimination having expressely put these out of your charge, the debate of them here were impertinent.

M. Tombes *too great delight to hunt contradictions.*

I find it your delight to catch your opposites in frequent contrarieties and contradictions: for my self I care the less to be cast in those Bocardo's, having so much good company with me, who will help if need be, to pull me out of these myres. In that one page I have been answering, you grant four of my contradictions.

The first, that I prove my challenge against you by a place where directly you denied my allegiance, and in this inadvertency M. *Marshall* and M. *Blake* has the good luck to be set at my side; but I hope I have relieved this contradiction, having proved by five or six of your passages in the two places you refer to, that you truly asserted what you would seem to deny.

My second contradiction is, that I make all the Anabaptists to deny to all infants all interest in God, in his promises, in his covenant; and yet *I* say some of them save all infants. How soone is this contradiction salved? are not diverse universall propositions even with the Syncatagorem of universalitie of an indefinite nature and sense, which admit the exception of some particulars, so that a tenet which generally Anabaptists doe maintaine, may be ascribed to the multitude, though some few among them be of a different judgement? If this please you not, let you take a second salve, which is your owne invention; these who save all infants doe not contradict them who exclude them all from all title to Gods covenant and promises; for they save them by vertue of election, and yet hold them out of the covenant and visible Church,

and

and deprive them of the promiſes of grace, for want of profeſſion whereof till 12per yeares they are not capable.

The third contradiction wherein you doe take me, is, that I prove your uncertaintie of the ſtate of infants by words which bear your certaintie thereof: *I* have looſed this priſoner before as unlawfully taken by your ſhifting of my clear formall words, and putting in for them another paſſage, that you might picke a quarrell, though here you fall in the pit you made for others, ſpeaking, as you will confeſſe, contrary to your ſelf, for which you have no other ſalvo but to correct your book putting inviſible for viſible, which I think indeed you intended.

The fourth contradiction which you catch, falls on M. *Marſhall*, whom you make to ſay that charity obliges us not to conclude certainly of the ſalvation of any infant, and yet to ſay that the ſalvation of all the infants of beleivers dying in their infancy is grounded on Gods promiſe to be the God of beleivers and of their ſeed: There is here no ſhadow of any contradiction; the ſpeaches not being to the ſame thing; though neither charitie nor veritie oblige us to determine the ſalvation of beleivers infants dying in their infancy definitely and in every particular, yet both charitie and veritie obliges us to determine it in the indefinite generall; and thus farre your owne charitie will goe without the hazard of any err[illegible]

The Second Crimination.

That M. *Tombs* makes Circumciſion a ſeal of another covenant then that of grace.

M. Tombs *incivil language.*

YOur Second falſe crimination is, that *I* ſay you make circumciſion a ſeal only of earthly and temporall priviledges, while as you truly make it a ſeal of ſpirituall promiſes; you will have me to take up my crimination from M. *Marſhall* his words, for which you marvell at his impudence, telling me that one might wonder any man ſhould have the face to draw you in ſuſpition of ſuch a thing. To Mr. *Marſhall* indeed you grant ſome ingenuitie in his impudence: but leaving his impudence to me, you take away his ingenuitie, and in place of it will have me in my owne conſcience to acknowledge my fraudulency. *Anſw.* Good M. *Tombs*, be pleaſed at your firſt leaſure, to ſcrape a little your tongue and to uſe ſome more civilitie of language towards your innocent neighbours. I will not, *I* dare not returne to you railing for railing. The challenge you ſpeak of, *I* had indeed the firſt ground of it from M. *Marſhall*, but that *I* inſiſted upon it, your ſelf was the only cauſe. M. *Marſhall* backed his quarrell which he calls a ſuſpition with a number of clear and diſtinct reaſons, at leaſt four, to which in your Apologie you reply not one word; this your ſilence when you were called to ſpeak, made me object it to you more poſitively; and if I had not reaſon ſo to doe, your ſelf may conſider: for even yet you anſwer not a word to any of M. *Marſhalls* reaſons which *I* objected to you in my citation; only you avow that you did write the contrary in your exercitation; this is no anſwer to a proven challenge; for you make all your adverſaries write frequent contradictions; and in the former crimination, I hope you may be convinced that you have written oft contrary to what you profeſſe to maintaine.

In

M. Tombs *will have the principall thing ſealed by circumciſion to be only temporall and not ſpirituall.*

In the 2 pag. of your exercitation whereto you refer, you make circumciſion a ſeale of Gods covenant with *Abraham*; but your very firſt conſideration upon it is, that the goſpell covenant is diverſe from and not the ſame with the covenant made with *Abraham*, this being not a pure goſpell covenant but a mixed one. *Is* it not clearer then that you make circumciſion to ſeale not the covenant of grace, which is a pure goſpell covenant, but another covenant of a diverſe nature from it, though in it were ſome ſpirituall promiſes, which you call a mixt covenant. Secondly, when in that place you had ſaid from M. *Cameron*, that circumciſion did ſeal the gracious promiſes which were in your mixt covenant only *Secundariò*, and the earthly promiſes *primariò*, when M. *Marſhall* had given to M. *Camerons primiario* and *Secundario* a benigne ſenſe agreeable to the authors mind and other writers, expounding the words of *primo* and *ſecundo*, yet doe you to this day ſignifie your acquieſcence in this benigne ſenſe; and doe you not rather ſtand to Mr. *Camerons* words as they ſound, that circumciſion did ſeal primarily and cheifly nothing but earthly and temporall promiſes, according as your friends, the *Dutch* Anabaptiſts, and their good ſcholer *Socinus* will have it?

Mr. Cameron *wronged by Du-mulin.*

I am truly greived that the miſcarriage of ſome of the ſchollers of that excellent divine M. *Cameron* (my maſter of happy memory) ſhould be ſo farre reſented by the moſt Reverend M. *Du-muline* and learned *Champovernow* as to fall ſo pitifully on his reputation in their late treatiſes: they profeſſe their belief of his preſent glory in the heavens; The world who knew him, cannot but witneſſe to a number of his excellent parts and eminent ſervices to the Church againſt all ſort of adverſaries; his freedome from and oppoſition to his ſchollers deviations, is legible in his printed workes as M. *Du-muline* acknowledges: why then contraty to divine and humane equitie, for the miſdemeanour of children ſhould any fall a tearing the face of the dead venerable parent? *I* think indeed M. *Du-mulins* cenſure of the tittle of thoſe *theſes de triplici fœdere*, and M. *Marſhalls* of the words of the ſeventie eight theſis in that ſenſe which *Mr. Tombs.* ſeemes ſtill to take them in, is not unjuſt: Yet it is ſtrange that *M. Tombs* ſhould bring *Mr. Cameron* for the countenancing of any thing that may further Antipadobaptiſme, ſince he was known all his lifetime to have been very farre from all that could look towards that art, what ever incommodious expreſſion of a word might once have fallen from his pen.

M. Tombs *makes the covenant with* Abraham *more legall then Evangelicall.*

Thirdly, in that ſame place of your exercitation whether you referre me, you declare your minde by way of doubt, that the covenant ſealed by circumciſion cannot be called ſimply Evangelicall, but rather ſimply legall, though it had annexed to it the ſacrifices wich pointed at the death of Chriſt. How much differs this from the tenet of the groſſeſt Anabaptiſts, that the covenant ſealed by circumciſion, notwithſtanding of ſome evangelicall appendices, yet in its owne nature and abſolutely was a true covenant of works as was that upon mount *Sinai*?

Mr. Tombs *mixt covenant for the principall parts of it belongs to no beleivers as beleivers.*

Fourthly, in that ſame place of your exception, albeit by way of doubt, yet clearly enough you import it is your minde, that the covenant ſealed by circumciſion is ſo farre from being in the owne nature of it evangelicall, but is ſo much a mixed covenant, that it does not at all belong to any beleever as he is a beleever.

Fifthly,

The spirituall appendices of Mr. Tombs mixed covenant belonged to no infants.

Fifthly, in that ſame place you tell us, not by way of doubt but poſitively that the evangelicall Appendices of that covenant did belong to beleevers as beleevers, and ſo to none but beleevers. The clear conſequent whereof I take to be, that the covenant ſealed by circumciſion had no ſpirituall promiſe at all which belonged to any infant; for no infant is a beleever. So to infants circumciſion ſealing up no ſpirituall promiſe, it could ſignifie and ſeal to them no more but earthly and temporall privileges, which was all I alleged upon you.

M. Tombs ſtudies to hide his minde.

I hope by this time it does appear that the falſhood of your ſecond Crimination will ſtick to your owne ribbes, except you pull it out with better anſwers then here you have brought: It is marvellous that you will not clear your ſelf of that which you call a falſe imputation by poſitive and clear aſſertions of the contrary truth: will you affirme clearly without circumloqutions, that you beleeve circumciſion to have been a ſeal of that covenant which not for the mixt and annexed promiſes, but of its owne nature was truly gracious and ſubſtantially one with that covenant which is now ſealed up by baptiſme? alſo that circumciſion did ſeal up to infants as well as to theſe of age, forgiveneſſe of ſinnes and ſalvation in Chriſts blood? poſitive affirmations to this purpoſe will in a few words end all quarrells in this point: but contumelious language, bare denials and references to the places of your former writings, which encreaſe rather then diminiſh jealouſies, and import that you maintaine, not only as *M. Cameron*, three covenants *naturæ*, *operum*, and *gratiæ*, but alſo a fourth, your mixt covenant, ſpecifically differing from all the three former, wherein to my knowledge you have no man going either before or after you: ſuch things will never clear you from my allegations.

M. Tombs mixt covenant is neither fœdus naturæ operum nor gratiæ, *but a fourth ſpecifically differing from all the three.*

The third Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombs* denies to Jewiſh infants all intereſt in the covenant of grace.

M. Tombs boldnes to deny what he affirmes.

YOur third falſe Crimination is, that I charge you with denyall to the Jewiſh infants, of all right to the Covenant of grace till they become actual beleevers. You ſay that I bring not a word to prove this my aſſertion, though I charged ſometimes on all my adverſaries, ſometimes on my principall adverſaries, among whom you will reckon your ſelf, though I name you not: you ſay that you deny what I charge upon you not only expreſſly but with abhorrence of it, Exerc. p. 24. Exam. p. 150. yea that you count it a madneſſe Exam. p. 109. *Anſw.* I wiſh truly that you were alſo free of all I charge upon you, as here you ſay you are; but the way you here take to evidence your clearneſſe does not the deed. Bring I not one word to prove my charge? that which you make the firſt three Criminations, was put by me only in one article, and all ſet downe in four ſhort lines, marked with one letter, at which I prove all I ſaid with diverſe teſtimonies both of your own pen, and of others concerning you. All that is brought in the two former challenges belongs to this, which you call the third, but by me was made only a part of that you call the firſt. Whether or not the abundant proofs I have brought for the two former charges, and

ſo for this third be good enough, you may trie when you will in your next eſſay.

For what you ſay I aſcribe to all the Anabaptiſts, I bring diverſe teſtimonies from the principall men of that faction; not in the place you cite, for there it had been impertinent, but in the proper roome, in my fourth chapter of the letters D.E.F. H.I.K. what in particular I aſcribe to you, ſince you will ranke you ſelf among the principall of that ſect which I there oppugne, *I* prove alſo, albeit not in the place you name, where it had been very improper, but in my fourth chapter at the letters A. A. where properly it falls in.

M. Tombs *does himſelf what unjuſtly he reproves in others.*

Your citation from my 151. pag. is brought by you in ſuch a manner that if *I* had done the like, you readily would have made outcries of my fraudulencie: you cut out in the beginning of my words the firſt ſentence, the key and greateſt ground of all there *I* was ſpeaking; even this paſſage [who profeſſe their willingneſſe to baptize any infants of whom they were certaine that they had the ſaveing graces of the holy ghoſt] The truth was, I took the ground of my ſeventh argument for infant baptiſme from your owne clear confeſſion, that if it were made good to you that any infants were truly ſanctified, you ſhould not doubt of their right to baptiſme, remembering the ſaying of *Peter* [can any man forbid water &c.] In your repenting of my argument, you ſcrape out that which was its maine ſtrength, a clear truth from the words of *Peter* expreſly granted by your ſelf, and you repeate only the negative part of my major, the excluding of infants from baptiſme on your beleif of their excluſion while they are infants from the covenant of grace.

This laſt part of my allegance upon you, you prove that you expreſly abhorred it from the 29. pige. of your Exercit. when I goe to the place, I find that the object of your abhorrencie is not at all (as here you would make us beleeve) the poynt I allege upon you, but a farre other, even the error of the Papiſts, that Infants not baptized neceſſarily periſh: you have indeed there a word which I like well; you ſay that you doe not doubt but elect Infants dying in their infancie are ſanctified: who would not think but it followed from this, that you were certaine and did not doubt that ſome infants in their infancie had all the things ſignified by baptiſme, and ſo that you did not doubt but ſome infants might be baptized, which is the very ſtate of the great queſtion.

The righteſt ſtate of the queſtion with the Antipaedobaptiſts.

For albeit in your Præcurſor. p. 41. You taxe M. *Baxter* & me for ſo ſtateing the controverſie, yet ſince you pretend ſo much to Logick, you cannot be ignorant that the faireſt ſtateing of a queſtion is by the flat and formal contradiction of the opponents tenet. Now as I take it, a particular Affirmative is the formal contradiction of an univerſall negative: an univerſall affirmative may well be contrary, but in the terms of art is in not the contradictory of an univerſall negative. So while the Anabaptiſts and you affirme that no infants are to be baptized, they contradict you better who ſay ſome infants are to be baptized, then who ſay that all are.

M. Tombs *when he has given the premiſſes, denies the concluſion.*

Alwayes *I* find you are not willing to let me make ſuch inferences as *I* was ſpeaking of, though they clearly follow from your words: for albeit you furniſh me this major, that all infants of whoſe ſanctification or being in the covenant of grace you are certaine, ſhould be baptized; and this minor alſo, But youare certaine of the ſanctification and being in the covenant of grace of diverſe infants, even of all elect ones, at leaſt of all elect ones dying in their infancy: If any will ſay that theſe two propoſitions are not yours, you will anoint him with unbeſeeming language: yet

yet their naturall product and conclusion, *Ergo*, some infants should be baptized, you abhorre as a superstition, and in the way M. *Marshall* defends it, as the most manifest heresie of any.

I foresee your starting hole, not so much that you name here in the 251. page of your Exam. that infants are only capable of grace, and have inward grace only potentially, but not actually; for this distinction implyes expresly that they have not truly any inherent grace, what ever they may have; yea in your preceding page, 149. you tell us plainly that no infant is capable of any grace at all by ordinary means. This indeed would prove all my challenge, as truly hetherto you have been so happy in your citations of your owne writings as to referre me alwayes to such passages for affirmatives, as imported the negative; or if for negatives, that imported the affirmative.

Mr. Tomb *makes all infants uncapable of grace unlesse by any extraordinary miracle.*

Besides this, your second citation contradicts your first, in the 94 page of your Exercit. when you say that you have no doubt not only of the potentiall inward grace of some infants, but that you have no doubt of the actuall sanctification of all elect infants dying in their infancy; I hope you will not make miracles and the extraordinary workes of the spirit so frequent as are elect infants dying in their infancy.

What ever grace Mr. Tombs *puts in any infants, he makes it to the Church as if it were not.*

But your true offcome is, that these elect infants are not knowne to men; That their election, sanctification and being in the covenant is to men as if it were not, since it is not perceptible except by an extraordinary miracle. Is not then all you talk of the election, sanctification, and being in the covenant of grace of any infant, *Jew* or *Gentile*, for no purpose at all? since you will have these things to be for no use to men, and to the Chuch upon their ignorance of the particular, and upon their inabilitie to determine of any singular infant that it is elected, sanctified or in the covenant: for all their knowledge, of the indefinite generall, or charitable judgement of some singulars, yet you will not permit the Church to bestow the benefit of baptisme upon these, though you affirme baptisme to be due to all unto whom the former graces do belong.

M. Tombs *sometimes seems to put saving faith and repentance in Turkish and Jewish infants.*

Beside all this, what ever true grace, faith or repentance you put in any elect Christian infants dying in their infancy, you put the very same in *Turkish*, *Jewish*, and *Paganish* infants who die before the yeares of their discretion. You would doe well here to explicate this your tenet, that we may consider of the nature of that grace, sanctification, faith and repentance, which without the word, and without all ordinances are wrought even frequently among *Turkes* and *Pagans*, and the greatest ignorants and enemies of Christ. Wee would also know if your judgement even of charitie be so straite, that what you grant to all the elect infants of *Turks*, *Jewes*, and *Pagans*, dying in their infancy (a very frequent and ordinary case as you make it) you may not grant to some, were it but to one elect infant of beleevers, before their maturitie and actuall beleiving.

M. Tomb, *studies to vexe his respondent with ambiguites.*

Your third citation is Examin. p. 109. here you would make us beleeve, that you are so far from denying that the children of beleevers are in the covenant of grace, that you say it were madnesse in any to doubt it. For all this in the very same page, you grant to me that you did formally deny to M. *Marshall* that the infants of beleeving parents were within the covenant of grace; were it not good

once to ſpeak ſo clear and diſtinct language, that all ambiguities might be laid aſide) what you count madneſſe to deny, was not the point in our controverſie? for it is nothing elſe but that which you call impoſſible for men, to write in or ſcrape out any from the book of Gods eternal election. This you will have to ſtand well enough with your denial of the propoſition in hand, that the infants of believing parents are within the Covenant of Grace: and with this affirmation alſo that many infants of *Turkiſh*, *Jewiſh*, and *Heathenish* parents are within the Covenant of Grace: and with this alſo, that no infant of any beleever is within the Covenant of Grace ſo far as is poſſible for any man to know without a revelation. Such turnings and windings will never diſpell a falſe crimination.

M. Tombes *needleſſe digreſſions.*

In all the reſt of this long Section you fall out in digreſſions totally impertinent to the crimination in hand: You write of many great feates you have done againſt M. *Marſhall*, M. *Geree* and others; that you have made them renounce their arguments, and no marvel, when you manifeſted that they were but weak, but ſhifting, but ſuperficial, but trifling, yea manifeſtly falſe, yea moſt manifeſt hereſie: when ſuch men as M. *Marſhall* and M. *Geree* bear in ſilence at your hands all theſe contumelies, which moſt eaſily they could have retelled, be pleaſed not to take my ſilence hereafter, or any mans elſe at your reproaches, for any ſelf-conviction of the truth of your imputations.

That part of your digreſſion which concernes me, is all for one poor word in the 132. page of my book, that I ſaid there, one of my propoſitions was grounded on nature of its terms; for that word alone you ſet upon my head a Garland of many flowers, both of your Rhetorick and Logick; onely to ſhew (as I take it) your great skill and my great ignorance in theſe arts; but when you have obtained all this, you wil be never the nearer purpoſe, which ſhould here have been in your hands, the purging away of your falſe criminations.

Mr. Tombes *oſtentation of his Logick, for little purpoſe.*

You will have leave to tell me firſt, that ſeldome you have met with a paſſage that has more abſurdity in it then that my forenamed halfe line: This to me is ſtrange, ſince immediately before in M. *Marſhall* (a man far my better) you named paſſages manifeſtly falſe, and moſt manifeſt hereſie. I hope you find not in my preſent words any ſo high abſurdity: But what is the matter? I ſet not down right the terms of my propoſition; let all this be ſo, yet there is no manifeſt falſhood, no moſt manifeſt hereſie in many more and greater Logical incongruities in a man of my age, who many years agoe have left the Logick Schools.

Mr. Tombes *unjuſt quarrel againſt the form of my argument.*

But what may this matter be? I will be judged in it not only by all the ſchollers in the world, but by M. *Tombes* himſelf upon his ſecond ſight, whether in my argument, for the form, there is any fault at all. My concluſion the true ſtate of the controverſy *I* had proved by a formal ſyllogyſme in the firſt figure in the mode *Darii* thus; Whoever have a good right to the firſt Sacrament of the New Teſtament, they ought to be baptized; but ſome infants have a good right to the firſt Sacrament of the New Teſtament. *Ergo*, ſome infants ought to be baptized. The Major needed no formal probation. I only cleared it by the ſimple expoſition of its terms. The minor alone controvertible, I proved by another formal Syllogiſme in that ſame figure and ſame mode, thus; Whoever have right to the chief promiſes of the New Teſtament, they have right to the firſt Sacrament of the New Teſtament, if the Lord hath not put ſome impediment to their participation of that Sacrament. But ſome infants have right to the chief promiſes of the New Teſtament, and God has

has put no impediment to their participation of that Sacrament. *Ergo*. As I thought it needlesse to prove the major of my former argument by any formal syllogisme, only I shew its natural clearnesse by opening in a word the terms of the proposition, the chief things in it, its subject and attribute: so I did with the Major of my second Syllogisme, saying that the strength of it lay in the nature of its terms, which are not the Syncatagorems, nor the determination of any of the terms, but only the subject and attribute of the proposition, which here were only the chief promises of the New Testament, and the first Sacrament of the New Testament: I said the strength of the whole proposition was grounded on the nature of these two terms, which were the principal parts, the one of the subject, the other of the attribute of the major proposition. The matter of my argument may be also weak, false, and heretical, as you can make it appear; but for any absurdity that is in its form, I refer it to your self in your after-thoughts, to give out the sentence.

Mr. Tombes *very illogical conceit.*

But it is indeed the matter of my argument you stick most on: To shew its absurdity, you raise a great cloud of pedantick school-dust for very little purpose; you say it is an illogical conceit to call an argument from the sign and seal of the thing signified and sealed, a reason from the nature of the terms; for whereever a reason is taken from the nature of the terms, there the one term must be included *In conceptu quiddativo alterius*, and cannot be conceived without the other. Are these meet debates for the like of us in so serious a purpose? yet since you will to your Logicks, I must remember you, as you did M. *Marshall* in the former page, to make a new Dictionary for the understanding of your new way, even in Logick. In a proposition where a *Genus* is affirmed of a *Species*, or a difference of a *Species*, or a propriety of a subject, cannot an argument be fetcht here for the proving of the proposition from the nature of any of the terms, as well from the nature of the *Species* and subject, as from the nature of the *genus*, difference and propriety? and yet is either the *Species* in the definition of its *Genus*, or of its difference, or is the propriety in the definition of its subject? in what University did you ever learn such Logick? But leaving this, if you will come to our purpose, is not the seal and the thing sealed, such terms, that the one is *in conceptu quidditavo alterius*? are they not *Relata secundum esse*? is it not the very definition of τὰ πρὸς τι κατὰ τὸ εἶναι that ὅσα αὐτὰ ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἑτερῶν εἶναι λέγονται; can a Relative be defined or conceived without its Correlative? what you speak of the eternity of the chief promises of the New Testament, and of their being long before the time of all their institute seales? You that must needs set your self down in the Logick Chair to teach us new Lessons in that faculty, let us know what this is to the purpose? Is it not ordinary for the subject of the relation to be conceived, and to be actually existent, before the subject of the correlation? need you be told that the man who is the father, is alwayes elder then the child he begets, and that yet the father is never prior neither in nature nor time, neither in conception nor existence to the son? are you yet to learn the most trivial lessons in Logick? The covenant and promises of it are before its seales; But is it imaginable that these things were signified and sealed before their seales were instituted? why should you shew us your Logick in such toyes, yea such falshoods?

Mr. Tombes *confusions and impertinencies.*

The following multitude of conceits you imagine to your self, brings me in mind of the story which M. *Marshal* applies to you of the man in *Cambridge*, who had the faculty, or rather the disease, of darkening the plainest Texts by his expositions; when you come at last to the clear and obvious sense of my words, that whoever has right

to the chief promises of the New Testament, has also right to the first Sacrament of the New Testament in *facie Ecclesiæ*, you do not deny it, but in plain terms grants my proposition: Why doth not this end the whole question? was there any other thing in controversie betwixt you and me, or betwixt the reformed Churches, and any *Anabaptist* in the question of *Antipedobaptisme*? some men would beseech you to be constant in your assertions, or else to remember what you assert of unligable *Proteus*.

You say, that my minor has clean another sense then my words and proofs import I conceived of it: This yo do not essay to shew, neither could you; for as my proposition, so my assumptions were clear and free of all ambiguitie, except you of purpose would set your head on work to invent them; and in such a case, no speech ever spoken, can be free of equivocations.

What you say, that the right to the seales comes from divine institution, and not from the nature of the terms, is, as you phrase it, a very illogical conceit. Are subordinates exclusive? It is from divine institution that the terms are conjoyned, that the Sacrament does seal the Covenant, and that the one gives right, or cleares the right to the other. Is there not an essential connexion, both constitutive and consecutive betwixt *Relatum* and *Correlatum*, σφράγις and ἐσφραγισμένον, as well, and more (because *mutuale*) then betwixt *Species* and *Genus*, *Subjectum*, and *Proprium*?

When you come down from your Philosophick chair, you return to your Theologick arguments: But how impertinent are they in this place? Think you it fit that I should grant you without all debate your chief scriptural arguments against *Pedobaptisme*? I am sure you cannot think this a fit place to debate them; knowing this much, as it seems, you return again to make a fresh on-set with your Logick: you tell me since by the nature of my terms, I mean that the promises of the Covenant are the things signified by the first Sacrament, I must by my Logick put the one in the definition of the other. I dispute not how Logical this your cosequence is, but let it passe: what is the inconvenient that the promises of the New Testament, especially in their relative nature, as things signified by the Sacrament, should be put in the definition of a Sacrament? did ever any define a Sacrament or any signe, but put in its definition the thing signified? what Logician ever made a relative extrinsecal to, or *minis notum* then its correlative?

But we must yet have more of your new Logick: The promise is an act, even an act of God: what would you conclude from this? doe Sacraments seal up no acts of God? or when we speak of the promises of the new Covenant, do we not understand the spiritual blessings promised to us of God? are these notions for any purpose, or is the next any better? The thing signified by the first Sacrament, say you, is not only some thing to come, but some thing past: The promise is Gods act, the Sacrament is the administrators act. Good M. *Tombes* pardon my shallow brains, for truly I do not conceive for what purpose in the world this language may serve.

Your next Logick Maxime *I* understand well, that the definition is inept where the *Genus* is not *prædicat. in quid* of the *definitum*, and where the definition is not reciprocal with the *definitum*, but you will more easily draw *Oxford* with Cart-ropes into the *Thames*, then from these grounds draw an argument to exclude relatives from one anothers definition.

After all these very idle and childish niceties of your Logick, you come at last to fall upon some possible sense of my very short and clear words. It may be you say I meant that it is of the nature of the first Sacrament to be a signe and seal of the chiefe promises of the New Testament: why did you so long

long beate the air did understand my words in any other sense then this which openly they carry? however against this sence you bring a new reason, that if it were true, then the right of the promises should be derived from the seal to the promises, and not from the promises to the seal; *Ecquid hoc ad Rhombum?* if there be a necessary connexion betwixt the two which is our only point whether the right be derived from this to that, or from that to this, or from a third to both, is it pertinent for us to debate in this place such a by-speculation?

What I subjoyne, that I make it the nature of the first sacrament alone excluding the second, to seal the cheif promises of the new-testament, it is nothing so; as it will afterward appear when you presse more seriously this mistake.

M. Tombs dangerous novations both in philosophy and divinitie.

Your following notions are more material, but much more dangerous: you deny expresly that a seal, or, as also you speak, a signe or a seal can be genus to a sacrament, because a Metaphor. What new Logick and Divinitie also is here? did ever any Protestant Philosopher or Divine before you deny *Signum* to be *genus remotum* of *Sacramentum*, or ἀρραβῶνας *Sigillum* or *signum certificans* to be *genus propinquum* to every particular sacrament? Who before you made the Apostles predication *Circumcisio est sigillum justitiæ fidei* to be Metaphorick and accidentall? doe we not see the ordinary disposers of the Categories to put in the Predicament of Relation, *signum*, *sigillum* and *Sacramentum*, as three true *genera* essentially subordinate one to the other? But I wish there may be no worse in this your new conceit, then the overturning of a peice of Logick, were it the whole Category of Relation. When you tell us of your lamentation, that so ordinarily in books and sermons sacraments are pressed to be seals, and that duties and privileges are builded on this Metaphore, you had need to speak out what may be at the bottom of this novelrie.

Neither am I lesse jealous of your next notion, that the sacraments doe not signifie as seals, so principally Gods promises to us, as our promises to God. As you avowe circumcision does not only *primo* but *primario* signifie things earthly and temporall, and *secundario* only things heavenly and spirituall; so here you teach that Baptisme, so farre as you are able to discerne, has for its cheife and primary use, to signifie our profession and promise to God, and not Gods promise to us. This may draw away from the most genuine and most comfortable use of the sacraments.

What you adde, that sacraments are signes not naturall but positive, signifying only from divine institution, none ever did question it; But your inference that therefore there is no connexion between the covenant and the seal, between the seal and the thing sealed from the nature of the terme but from divine institution, I told you that this is an evill consequence; and if it were good, it behoved to have for its foundation a new Logick maxime contradicting the old one *in terminis*, even this, *Subordinata pugnant*.

You taxe me for reasoning from the cheife promises of the new-testament to the first signe, more then from the not cheife promises to the second signe. And that of the promises of the new-testament I make some cheife and some not cheife: For these things my reasons are plaine. *In the new-testament* some promises are of the kingdome of heaven, and some of this life: *It is* Christs expresse command to make these in the first kind prior, and these in the second posterior, as in their intrinsecall worth, so also in our estimation. Though in Circumcision you make temporall promises primary, and spirituall secundary; yet *I* beleive in Baptisme you will grant that spirituall promises are sealed principally, and temporall but secondarily. Also among spirituall blessings some are fountaines, roots, and causes, others streams, branches,

and

and effects: the nature of the thing makes the first more principall, and the second lesse. For preventing the cavills of the Anabaptists, I put in my argument the chiefe promises of the New Testament, to wit, Christ himself, his spirit, eternall life, also remission of sinnes, sanctification, the covenant of grace; for the same cause I put in the argument the first Sacrament: for after that the Lord had appointed any seals of his blessings, I judged that whoever had the great and maine blessings which were signified and sealed, ought not to be excluded from all the seals, however upon particular reasons they might be excluded from some: And if they were admitted to any, the first initiating seal behoved to be it, especially since no impediment was put by God in the way of beleivers children, wherefore they might not participate this Sacrament. Whatever in this ratiocination you quarrell, is all debated by me in its proper place.

Why some Beleevers under the old Testament, were not circumcised.

A bit of my debate you bring in here, and labour to throw it towards your error, but without reason. Be it so that the ground of circumcision was not simply the common right of beleevers to the Covenant of Grace, but their right so modified, that they were of the stock of *Abraham* either naturally or by adjunction to that people, it does not follow. But now when that modification by divine appointment ceases, the common right of believers to the Covenant may well intitle to Baptisme by Scripture rules, drawn from the administration of circumcision to infants, and that the argument from that analogy stands firm by divine appointment, as in my debates upon the point I clear in its proper place. *Melchisedeck*, *Lot*, and *Job*, were excluded from circumcision by divine appointment, which did appropriate that Sacrament to *Abrahams* family alone, and those who were joyned thereto as ascititious members thereof: this was the condition of *Proselites* by Gods expresse order in the institution of circumcision, *Gen.* 17. *Melchisedeck*, *Lot*, and *Job*, not being in that condition, though the righteousnesse of faith, and the principal promises of the Covenant, absolutely without the forenamed modification belonged to them, yet were they not capable of the Sacrament, by God his revealed will, appointing it so. No prejudice is here to the Baptisme of infants, nor to any argument I brought for it.

Mr. Tombes *absurd objection of absurdity.*

If all this your grosse mist make my third challenge a false crimination, or shew any fault in my argumenting from the Covenant to its seal, from the chief promises to some seal, even to the first seal; from the nature of the terms, from one Relative to another, betwixt which there is a necessary connexion, and ever an Ἀναπόδοτος πρὸς τὸ ἀντιστρόφως, from the seal to the promises sealed, let any reader judge, when he has tasted of this your new and (as I conceive) truly absurd Logick.

The Fourth Crimination.

M. *Tombes* defends it lawful in sundry cases for persons unbaptized, to baptize.

Mr. Tombes *avowes all I alledged here upon him.*

YOur fourth false accusation, that I said you gave power to unbaptized persons to baptize others; you avow this here in plain terms, and so you take off me to your self the calumny: why do you cry so loud that you are calumniated by me for ascribing

ascribing to you that which you avow openly is your tenet? whether right or wrong, this is not the place of debate, where my only task is to shew that *I* laid nothing to your charge, but what was truly yours. All that I speak here more is *ex superabundanti & supererogatione*. It is well then that you have acknowledged this charge *in terminis*, and as in your *Praecursor* at large you avow; that private men without all ordination, without all lawful call may go to the Pulpit and preach, may celebrate both the Sacraments; so, here you go further, that men not yet initiate with the first Sacrament to Christianity, may lawfully and rightly baptize others.

M. Tombes *seems to maintain with* Aquinas, *that Jewes and Turkes may validly baptize.*

For this strange tenet, you bring two authorities, the first is *Aquinas parte tertia quaest.* 67. *art.* 5. while you bring this testimony without any limitation or explication, give you us not ground to suppose, till you have cleared your self, that you embracce *Thomas* doctrine in that place, which is, that these who belong not at all to the Church, *neque Sacramento neque re*, even *Turks*, *Jewes*, and *Pagans*, may lawfully baptize? And if this be your mind, speak it out clearly to the world. Your principles and profession also make you oft refuse the only ground which *Thomas* has for that his very grosse tenet, the necessity of baptisme for salvation; since, you refuse the erroneous ground, how can you approve the erroneous superstructure?

Mr. Tombes *misapplies* Zanchius.

Your other citation from *Zanchius* makes nothing to your case; he in that same place refutes at length what you bring from *Aquinas*, and the case which *Zanchius* proposes you dissembled. The words immediately preceding your citation, and immediately following clear the Authours mind, which you disguise. This case is of a *Turk* far from all Christians converted by God immediately in reading the Gospel, and converting his family and others to the faith, when he has gathered and erected a Church, and is minister thereof, whether he and that Church may create another minister, a *Symmista* with him, who when he is a publick minister, may baptize and be baptized. Does this look any thing like your case? did these extraordinary ministers ever renounce Infant-baptisme as a nullity? did they live in such a Christian Nation as *England*, and cry down the baptisme of all the land but a handful of *Anabaptists?* did did they refuse to take baptisme, when easily they might have received it from them they acknowledged truly baptized Christians? and without any necessity at all, venture to baptize others before they were baptized themselves? this is your case. *Zanchius* question looks not any thing near it. As for your other citations, it is needlesse to look on them, since you avow the whole challenge, and as it seems, much more.

The Fifth Crimination.

M. *Tombes* is the first Apologist for the *Anabaptists* of *Munster*.

AS for your fifth false Crimination, I did not say so much in it as you acknowledge M. *Marshall* and M *Geree* had printed before me; to wit, that you shewed good will to the *Anabaptists* of *Munster*, that you were the first of our divines who did suspect the overlashing of our Protestant Historians concerning them, that your comparing of the *German Anabaptists* with the old *Puritans* in *England*, did grieve them, and was extreamly scandalous to them: M. *Geree* wonders and

 marvels

marvels at your uncharitable and unjuſt thoughts. I never alledged that you did maintain the wicked practiſes of *Munſter*, but only that you had made Apologies for the men, more then any Proteſtant divine before you: and although M. *Marſhall* and M. *Geree* had complained of you ſadly for it, yet you do it over again in your Apology clearly and at length, as any who pleaſes to read may ſee. And even in in this your anſwer to me you perſiſt in the ſame way, profeſſing openly that you ſuſpend your judgement of ſome parts of the relations of the *Anabaptiſts* at *Munſter*, importing that as M. *Marſhalls*, M. *Gerees*, and my reports of you are but miſreports and palpably unrighteous, if not malicious accuſations; ſo you think it might well have been with thoſe who accuſed the *Dutch Anabaptiſts*. You avow your intention to take off the *odium* which was put on the way of the *Anabaptiſts*, by remembring the horrible fruits which the ſpirit that firſt led them in *Germany*, did bring forth in the eye of all the world: you ſtill continue to do that which M. *Marſhall* profeſſed was his great grief and extream ſcandal from you; even to put upon the *Antiprelatiſts* and *Puritans* (as they were called) in Queen *Elizabeths* time, not only the Separatiſts, but the unconform miniſters, you will have conſpirers with *Hackets* wickedneſſe, and like to the *Anabaptiſts* of *Munſter*: yea, you are become now ſo charitable, as to put upon us alſo your covenanted brethren, the ſuſpicion of no leſſe wickedneſſe then the *Monaſterian Anabaptiſts* were guilty of: you tell us plainly you fear that the Presbyterians can act the like things for their Presbytery, that the *Anabaptiſts* did for their Anabaptiſme.

You imploy the utmoſt of your Lecture for the extenuation of the *Anabaptiſts* enormities, ſhewing that the hiſtories of them of *Munſter* proceeded from their enemies the Biſhop and Cannons of that town, or from deſerters and captives, who did but feign tales of them for their own ends; yea to ſhew further your mind to excuſe theſe unhappy men you bring in this very place without any ground at all, a paſſage out of the ſtory of the *Netherlands*: You tell us the Inquiſition of *Flanders* adviſed the King of *Spain* to hire theeves and robbers to ſpoile Kirks, and commit ſuch wickedneſſe, as was poſſible, that their offences might be imputed to the Proteſtants of *Holland*; from this you inſinuate that poſſibly they were not true *Anabaptiſts*, but *Emiſſaries* from the *Pope* and *Jeſuits*, who either of old, or this day, have vented the horrible opinions, and attempted or really practiſed the actions which make the *Anabaptiſts* odious, when they themſelves are for truth and reformation. This indeed is a pretty invention, for the which, the worſt *Anabaptiſts* owe you many thanks.

The beſt of the Anabaptiſts are not good.

What you ſpeak of the *Mennoniſts*, as condemning them of *Munſter*, and being free of all their wayes, I proved that even the *Mennoniſts* did approve them of *Munſter* as the Saints of God, notwithſtanding of all raſhneſſe and infirmities. I proved alſo the *Mennoniſts*, which to you are the beſt of all the *Anabaptiſts* over ſea, their continuing to teach moſt horrible hereſies, and to practiſe moſt ſhameful ſchiſmes.

By what you have written here and in your Apology, it will appear to any impartial Reader, that no man in *Brittain*, or any other reformed Church, has to this day come nearer unto you in Apologizing for the worſt of the *Anabaptiſts*, even the *Tragedians* of *Munſter*.

The

The Sixth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* inveighes against our Reformers first, last for their oppoſition to the *Anabaptiſts*.

IS there any falſhood in the ſixth Crimination? I ſaid you made invectives againſt the firſt Reformers, for oppoſing *Anabaptiſts*. The places I brought from your writings, carried your declaring againſt *Luther* by name as pertinacious in refuſing to *Nicholas Storke* the removeal of all *Pedobaptiſme*; Alſo againſt *Zurick* and *Zwinglius* the miniſter thereof, for not yeilding to *Baltazer Heubner*, that peſtiferous *Anabaptiſt* his motions, who by his wickedneſſe baniſhed the reformed Religion out of the City of *Waldſhut*; and as if it had not been enough to have railed on theſe two, you fall a blaming the whole reformed Churches, and particularly the late Reformers of *England*, who refuſed at the *Anabaptiſts* deſires to remove *Pedobaptiſme*. If theſe be not ſufficient invectives againſt our Reformers, you furniſh us more both in your *Examen* and Apology. There page 22. you fall a railing on *Luther* again, for his vehemency and pertinacy againſt the *Anabaptiſts*; and *Melanchton*, for his timerouſneſſe in not ſiding courageouſly with the *Anabaptiſts* againſt *Luther*: yea upon *Calvin*, *Zwinglius*, *Hoſiander*, and upon all the reformed Churches, as if their fate had been unhappy for ſticking ſo faſt to *Luther* and *Calvin*, and maintaing ſo ſtiffely their grounds againſt the *Anabaptiſts* farther reformation. If theſe be your milde expreſſions againſt our Reformers in the defence of the *Anabaptiſts*, we know not what Dialect of language you may uſe, when you come to your invectives.

The Seventh Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* inveighes againſt the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*.

YOur ſeventh falſe Crimination is, that I ſaid you inveighed againſt the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*: For this challenge I brought paſſages from your writings, which bore firſt your ſtiling the members of the Aſſembly by the Nickname of *Pedobaptiſts*. Secondly, in your wiſh you object to theſe *Pedobaptiſts* the members of the Aſſembly, their great inconſtancy that they would ſtick to nothing in the point of your controverſie. Thirdly, that great weakneſſe, that one of their prime members M. *Marſhall*, was not able to deal with a ſhort writing of yours alone, unleſſe he had ſundry of the ableſt of the Aſſembly to help him in that work: and as if all theſe ſpeeches had not been diſhonourable enough to the Aſſembly in their firſt printing, you are pleaſed here to print them over again with new amplifications. You caſt up to the members of that Aſſembly, not onely *Pedobaptiſme*, but their *Proteus*-like unconſtancy therein: In ſtating one branch of a queſtion, you reckon out above ten variations among them: neither are you content ſo to abuſe the other members of that Aſſembly, but you muſt fall upon the weakneſſe of their moſt worthy Prolocutor, by name M. *Herle*; how eminently learned, pious, and modeſt a man? yea in this very place you muſt print the defects, the blemiſhes, the impertinencies, the riddles of the whole Aſſembly. If for all this M. *Marſhall* ſay that you caſt filth in the face of the Aſſembly, you muſt print him an injurious accuſer:

and if I ſpeak of your inveighing againſt the Aſſembly, I muſt be a falſe Crimi-nator for this ſo clear a truth.

The Eighth Crimination.

Mr *Tombes* inveighes againſt the Church of *Scotland*.

I Alledged you did inveigh againſt the Church of *Scotland*; That your words which I brought to prove this challenge, were indeed againſt the Church of *Scotland*, this was my reaſon; The ſubject of them, the managers of juridical excommunication, was true of none within the whole Iſle, nor had been true of any for twelve years at leaſt, but the Church of *Scotland* alone; where elſe was the cenſure of excommunication executed juridically? That the matter of your ſpeech was ſhamefully invective, is apparent to any who are not habituated to hear very evill language; to ſuch ears the harſheſt ſounds may be pleaſant and melodious. Your words imported but theſe ſmall *Peccadillo's*; Firſt, the abuſing of a holy ſpiritual Church-cenſure, and turning it into an engine of harme. Secondly, the Church of which you ſpoke, their ſparing to exerciſe their cenſures upon perſons openly vitious, and excommunicating only men diſſenting from their opinions, and oppoſing of their profits. Thirdly, Their irreconcilableneſſe with any who differed from them in judgement. Fourthly, Their great favour to vice it ſelf. All theſe crimes laid moſt innocently on the back of a National Church (as I rationally conceived they were) muſt be taken for no invective; but whoever will alledge ſo much, muſt be printed a falſe Criminator: I doubt if you will have any reaſonable men to joyn with you in this ſentence.

The Ninth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* Invectives againſt Mr. *Marſhall*.

YOur ninth falſe Crimination concernes M. *Marſhall*. I ſaid you inveighed againſt him. I brought for this your own words, wherein you tell tales of M. *Marſhals* engine, that he was a man ſo given to miſtaking, as could not but vex any who had to deal with him in diſpute, and that you had found it ſo. Elſewhere you cry out on him as ſo confuſed a diſputer, that you knew not to what purpoſe the manner of his writing ſhould tend but to puzzle his Reader, and to weary his Reſpondent: That though you had told him of this, and deſired him to mend his fault, yet that thing which he called his argument, and an argument of a plain ſenſe, had ſo many ambiguities, was ſo inform and ſhapeleſſe, that you knew not whether he would make many ſyllogiſmes, or one, nor what was his major, or what his minor propoſition; what was his major, minor, or middle term. All this ſpoken of one of the moſt eminent men in the Iſle, muſt be no invective, becauſe indeed no Oration to make odious. *I* thought injurious and untrue ſpeeches to impare a mans reputation, to make him contemptible and ridiculous, had been in common language invectives: If you will have nothing to be an invective but a ſolemn Oration, like the *Philippicks* of *Cicero* and *Demoſthenes*, or the *Stelliteuticks* of *Nazianzen*, the ableſt Orators of the

Mr. Tombes *wrong definition of an invective.*

the world in their dayes; *I* shall then indeed yeild that *I* charged you wrong with invectives in this your new sense, as being far above that which I or any *I* know ever conceived of your abilities, though in themselves as great as you like to call them; only that you have put more scornes, jeares, and scoffes upon M. *Marshall* in print, then any man who was not a profest Master in *Rabelars* School, ever did on any honest man. You tell us your self at length in your Apology, page 31, &c. from M. *Marshals* formal complaints, in such words and pages which you cite, large to the number (as I take it) of one and twenty Criminations.

The tenth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* inveighing against Mr. *Thomas Goodwin*.

YOur tenth false Crimination is, that *I* said you inveighed against M. *Thomas Goodwin*; It is good that you give me M. *Marshall* to be my foreman in this complaint, of whom you tell me both here and in your Apologie, p. 18. that he did challenge you for going out of your way to vilifie M. *Thomas Goodwin*: your words cited by M. *Marshall*, and from him by me, vilifying M. *Goodwin*, were that his arguments were but similitudes, and conjectures, and delusions; these here you repeate and maintaine, shewing that when you expected arguments from M. *Goodwin*, you found your self but deluded with his conjectures nothing to the purpose.

My judgement of M. Cotton and M. Goodwin.

Your retortion on me mends not the matter; though my speeches also had been invectives, does this hinder yours to be of the same kinde? albeit in the place you cite from me there is nothing but a bare argument against M. *Goodwin* his expolition of the holinesse of infants, which in the face of the assembly was professed upon him large as faire as there *I* doe prosecute it.

Both in that place and elsewhere *I* have profest my difference from M. *Goodwin* in some things concerning Church government; but for any vilifying of the man, my heart was ever farre from it: I have ever esteemed his parts very excellent; yea of the Independent party on this side of the *American* seas, I counted him ever the most able and eminent; as on the other side of these seas Reverend M. *Cotton*: My only and frequent lamentation about these two was and is that so excellent spirits and parts should have been imployed in furthering that which I conceived one of the great fountaines of all the present miseries of this poore Isle.

The eleventh Crimination.

M. *Tombes* enveighs against all his oppolites as Montebankes, *ignes fatui*, factious, and men of weak parties.

WHat falshood is in your eleventh Crimination? *I* said you inveighed against others also beside the men forementioned: It is true you made no *Philippicks* nor *Stelitentieks* against them; but that you used very disgracefull speaches of the best of your Oppolites, your owne words I brought (whereof yet you repent not) do sufficiently prove. In them you regrate that such men as your self and other Anabaptists, who cleared the truth, were misregarded; and all others, whether

of the assembly of Divines, or of the Ministry of *London*, or anywhere in *England*, who were noted or regarded by the people, had all their reputation grounded upon this, that they were popular orators, or had the countenance of some great men, or were some way usefull to uphold factions. You tell us also, that the wounds which your darts had given to infant Baptisme, were so deep and uncureable, that when all your opposites had done their uttermost they would but play the Montebanks, and never be able to answer you, but would only skin over the wounds your hands had made without any reall cure. In all this language was there not so much as a complaint against any one man, but only a milde mentioning of the experiment you had of all your Opposites? Surely if you would give such a measure to your neighbours in distributing of your censures, as you take to your self, you would not have so many adversaries as this day are upon your arme. That ever Dr. *Twisse* does speak so of his neighbours, as here you doe, you make it not appear. However I hope you will grant that M. *Marshall* takes off me this Crimination, while as you bring him in, in your owne Apologie. p 27. avowing that you cast scorne not only upon himself, which he offers to bear at your hand, but on the faces of all Divines ancient and moderne, as if they were *ignes fatui*, or so simple ones as by a fooles fire to be misled in a bog. To this challenge among other answers you make this the first, that you pitie M. *Marshalls* distemper.

You mind me here of my want of charitie, because I did not speak with you before I had printed your incivilitie & indiscretion, you living so neer unto me in the Temple at the time when *I* wrote my book: truly in this place I did object no incivilitie nor any indiscretion to you: *I* said no more but that you did flee as high as any civil or discreet Anabapeist, which imports your keeping within the bounds of the ordinary civilitie and discretion of the partie in these challenges which there *I* challenge: Where you did live when I wrote my book, I neither did know nor mind; for *I* had never any the least acquaintance with you. What I did print in my treatise of Anabaptisme concerning you, was no more then what your self and other very eminent Divines had printed before me, which in a publick quarrell importes not the incroaching upon any dutie I know.

The Twelf Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* makes Baptisme an unnecessary Rite.

WHat you spoke of M. *Goodwins* similes, I may truly say of your Criminations; you spinne them out to a needlesse length, and multiplie their number without cause. My first challenge you divided in three Criminations, and here an other you divide in other three, as thereafter a third you cut in four. I said you made baptisme a needlesse rite not only to infants, as you avow, but even to Christians of riper age: I proved this by three reasons which you divide in so many false Criminations. The first was that you tell us of sundry not bized till their old age, you speake of *Constantine* and others: I expresst *Ambrose* as one of these others; and was this a great fault in me to be noted, that I instanced on particular of your generall? But when *I* look back on your Apologie, I find you name a better then either *Constantine* or *Ambrose*; The Apostle *Matthew* whome you think probably was never baptized. Who brings us approved examples of so many who lived without baptisme, without all necessitie, what can men judge but that to him baptisme is an

unnecessary

unneceſſary rite? When you ſay that you gave no approbation to *Conſtantine* his practiſe, who will take this off your hand? ſince you bring in his example not only without any ſignification of diſlike, but alſo as an argument to prove your owne concluſion. That the examples you bring of thoſe who lived without baptiſme are truely approved of you, that of the Apoſtle *Mathew* puts it out of all doubt; for I hope the examples of the Apoſtles admitted of by Chriſt you will approve.

Mr. Tombs *admits perſons unbaptized to the holy table in frequent caſes.*

I did prove alſo that you counted baptiſme an unneceſſary rite, by this, that you admitted unbaptized perſons to the holy table: M. *Marſhall* marked in you this ſingularitie before me, as an itch in you more then other Anabaptiſts after novelties and ſingularities of your owne; for this you gird him with what language you like beſt. As for me, when I cite your words to prove my alledgance which even here you doe not deny, becauſe I leave out ſome of your lines, as diverſe times you doe in citing of my words, for this you tell me that I cite your words as the devil did Chriſts. The words which I omitted only for ſhortneſſe, were nothing for my advantage; for immediately before that place I cited, you avow that ſingular tenet, in more groſſe terms then any I alledged: you avow not only a lawfullneſſe and neceſſitie upon conſcience to admit unbaptized perſons to the holy table in one caſe, but you will have the Miniſter to ſinne if he admit not unbaptized perſons to the table in three caſes and more, which now a dayes are very frequent. While for ordinary and frequent ſcruples unbaptized perſons muſt be admitted to the Lords ſupper, and while for ſuch ſcruples as you reckon men may lawfully live ſtill without baptiſme, and while that you import that Chriſt allowed *Mathew* to live and die unbaptized, and that *Conſtantine* and others were allowable in their needleſſe delay of baptiſme to their old age: while from ſuch reaſonings of yours *I* did conclude your counting baptiſme a rite not very neceſſary, I hope *I* ſhall be found in this not to be ſo ridiculous as they who reaſon a *baculo ad angulum.*

Mr. Tombs *way tends towards the ſeekers.*

That you will have me partaker with M. *Marſhall* in his ſlie inſinuation of your Socinianiſme, truly I did mind no ſuch thing: but upon this your motion *I* begun indeed to think that as many of your friends among the Anabaptiſts, eſpecially M. *Saltmarth*, from your Antipedobaptiſme did ſlide on to the rejecting of all baptiſme, yea of all ordinances, towards a full ſeeking, ſo that you in theſe your novelties were going on ſome peice of that way, to make the uſe of any baptiſme but a thing very indifferent.

The Thirteenth Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombes* went on in his Miniſtry neglecting to be baptized.

ANother of my arguments to prove your eſteem of baptiſme to be an unneceſſary rite, was your ſo long neglect of that Sacrament in your own perſon that to that very day you could not ſay you were baptized; for this you give me what language you thinke fit: you will have me a very bold man in judging of your thoughts; you will have me to expect Gods judgment for this; you call me rath, partiall and falſe in my accuſation. Was there any cauſe at all for this good language? It is true *I*

ſpeak

ſpeak of your careleſneſſe of your owne baptiſme, but I meant this not ſo much of your thoughts and cares of your heart, as of your open neglect to practiſe a dutie which ſhould not have been ſecreet but open and ſolemne, when men are not aſhamed of it. What ever inward ſolititude and perplexitie was in your mind about your receiving of baptiſme, yet what could I or any man elſe think when you avowed openly the nullitie of your infant-baptiſme, and without receiving of any other bapuſme, ſo farre as the world knew, went about all the parts of your Miniſteriall calling, I ſuppoſe the celebration of baptiſme, and of the Lords ſupper to your flock? Who ever looked upon this your way, could they ſay leſſe then that you were careleſſe of your owne baptiſme? your thoughts and hearty cares I leave to your ſelf; it was your practiſe that I aimed at; and you grant here and elſewhere that you were not baptized, till upon that my advertiſement, you were quickened to think more ſeriouſly upon that matter. This my good ſervice to you, deſerved not ſo much evil language, not only againſt me, but for my occaſion, againſt all theſe of my mind, the brethren of *London* who knew you better then I, to whom you object want of all charity towards you, yea, as you love to ſpeake in your dialect, exceſſive impiety againſt you; you tell the world that they had ſhewed little, yea, no tender regard of you, but ſet themſelves to make you odious, to keepe you under in your credit and eſtate, and to hinder you in the work of the miniſtry of the Goſpel. How much you are in the wrong unto your brethren, their cariage to you, even as its ſet downe in your owne Apologie, will clear to any intelligent Reader.

Mr. Tombs *cauſleſſe bitterneſſe.*

The fourteenth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* ſo farre a Separatiſt that he counts it lawfull to live without membership in any particular congregation.

TO prove your want of baptiſme at the time when I wrote, ſuppoſing from your owne writings that you were then no Separatiſt, *I* uſed this as one argument; *If* you were baptized, it behoved to be in ſome of the Anabaptiſts congregations; but I thought you could not be baptized in any of them, except you had been willing to have joyned with them in membership; and this I ſuppoſed you could not doe ſo long as you ſtood to your owne declarations of your unwillingneſſe to gather a ſeparate congregation, and ſo to live in a ſeparate congregation: all the Anabaptiſts congregations were engaged in ſo high a degree of Separation, that they refuſed communion even with the Independents and Separatiſts themſelves who could not remitt their infant baptiſme: *I* muſt here alſo be a falſe accuſer, though all that *I* intended to ſay, you grant expreſly, that however now you think otherwayes, yet then when I wrote, you were not either for gathering of ſeparate congregations, nor for membership in any of them; ſo long as that was your mind, you could not be baptized in any ſeparate congregation, nor could they be willing to give you, or you to receive from them any baptiſme.

That which here you tell of, your willingneſſe to communicate occaſionally with any Anabaptiſticall Church, and yet not to be a fixed member in any of them; alſo of their willingneſſe to baptize you on ſuch conditions as you name, had need to be more cleared; for it ſeems to import firſt, that you beleeve that you may be a member of the Church univerſall, and yet no member of any particular Church though you

live

live in the midst of many particular congregations, and might easily joyne with them if you would. Secondly, That the seven Anabaptist Churches who are clear enough for no admitting of any of the Independents or Separatists who will not receive a new baptisme, yet were all of them ready to receive you as a member and to baptize you, so that your want of baptisme and your living out of all particular Churches did proceed from nought else but your owne freewill. Thirdly, That the Anabaptists are the most clear Separatists in the world; for they separate from the Separatists themselves and all Churches in the world wherein infant-baptisme is practized: So that your joyning now with them, and taking baptisme from them declares the change of your mind from that *I* cited before of your unwillingnesse to joyne with Separatists. Fixednesse or unfixednesse makes nothing to the poynt of membership it self; and I suppose that all who can joyne with a separate congregation as a member thereof, can also upon occasion, be a gatherer of a separate congregation.

The Fifteenth Crimination.

M. *Tombes* is for the lawfulnesse of dayly Rebaptization.

YOur fifteenth false Crimination is, that I say you maintaine the lawfulnesse of rebaptization. Was this any Calumny? doe you not, even in this very place, acknowledge the thing, and all my proofes of it? The best arguments you knew for once baptizing, you brought and refuted: this alone had been enough to have demonstrated your clear inclination to goe beyond the Anabaptists to a rebaptization. For what man is he that refutes all the reasons he knowes of a common tenet, and so leaves it groundlesse and reasonlesse, but he uses to be charged for deserting of that tenet? But you went further then all this; you brought diverse reasons for th contrary, even for rebaptization, three at least: you reason not only for rebaptizing once, but so oft as we heare the word, as we are sanctified, as we are mortified, yea, as we repent for sinne. This *I* said was enough for any Hemerobaptization and more. Doe you not even here avow all this? and yet my objection of rebaptization to you must be a false Crimination.

When all *I* said of you in my text was sufficiently proved, there was a circumstance in the end of my quotation, wherein (I grant) you find me misinformed. I was told that the sermon which here you say is M. *Cradocks* had been yours, and this is all the misinformation I remember you findin my whole book: But how unconsiderable a circumstance is this that you should ground upon it so fierce an invective? *Is* not my whole challenge proved without this citation; and the whole passage I cited in that sermon, doe ye not fully avowe it as truth? yea, since you maintain the lawfulnesse (the necessitie was never alledged upon you) to be baptized so oft as we hear the word or repent; go you not far beyond all was cited from that Sermon? the lawfulnesse of rebaptization, ten, twenty, or an hundred times, though you may think it convenient to be baptized but once. For this one mistake, into how bitter & scurrilous language break you out, not upon me alone, but upon the whole generation of Presbyterians? that they are all apt to receive false reports, and to publish them upon any who dissent from them, that they rake into every dunghill to find some filth to throw on the faces of their brethren: that their forwardnesse to misreport, disreport, discovers much evill affection in their spirits; that they are grown factious; that the Presbyterian spirit will run in undue courses as well as the Anabaptistick spirit; that they take

up all in their dragnet, be it true or false. That these are the best pillars they are to uphold the great corruption of their Pedobaptisme: that they give much cause to considerate men to doubt of the truth of that which hitherto has been reported of Anabaptists: that for this their behaviour, godly men are very unwilling to come under their government. M. *Tombes*, if on so poor an occasion of one circumstantial fail from the hand of one *Mordecai*, your heart serves you to pour out on the whole nation of the Jewes, such a huge spet of opprobries, it is too like you have within your breast a spirit of a strange temper; you shall have no more from me for all your reproaches.

The sixteenth Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombes* admits many persons unbaptized to the Lords Supper.

YOu make me a false Criminator the sixteenth time for saying that you maintain it lawful for persons unbaptized to participate of the Lords Table, and yet both here and before you acknowledge the certain truth of all I alledge: onely here you fall out upon reproofs against M. *Marshall* and me, large seven times, for no fault at all. You are angry that we set not down all the limitations you proposed in that your opinion; and that we answered not the reasons you brought for it; was there any need for us to have done either of these two? M. *Marshall* did but by the way tell you of your itch after new opinions, and marked this for one, that you admitted to the Lords Table persons unbaptized; did it concern him to take consideration of those frequent cases you named for that new and absurd practice? And when I am but clearing the state of the question by way of narration of stories about it, did it concern me to answer the reasons which are brought by adversaries of that narration not being come to my argumentative part. You may be well assured, that such poor shifts as these will never convict me of a false Crimination.

The seventeenth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* a greater *Erastian* then any *Anabaptist* will allow.

YOur next false Crimination is, that I called you a compleat *Erastian*; all that I meant was, that you followed the way of *Erastus* in Church discipline very grossely and largely, as much as any Divine in the Ile, so that it appeared you were resolved to adde to your Anabaptisme these things that would make your way more singular, wherein the Anabaptists whether *English* or *Dutch*, keeping their own principles, could not joyne with you. You will not here permit me in any thing to be a Calumniator, but all I say you make good in this self-same place. In the defence of *Erastianisme*, you fall out not only on M. *Marshall* and me as prevaricators, but ramble up and down, casting your darts at the face of all *Erastus* opposites, M. *Rutherford*, M. *Gillasby*, the Assembly at *Westminster*, the Prelates, the Independents: Why do you not adde the Anabaptists, who are as much *Anti-Erastian* as any you have named?

You

Mr. Tombes *is against ruling Elders; and all Ecclesiastick Courts.*

You make the two main points of *Erastianisme* to be excommunication, and a mixed Presbytery of Ministers and Elders: you say you are not against this second, but rather for it. Are you indeed for any divine right for Elders to be ruling officers in the house of God? or, are you for the divine right of any Ecclesiastick Court in the Church? Though you admit in a prudential way, that some may meet to cognosce upon offences, yet will you give to them when so met any authority, or the least spiritual jurisdiction? will you not have any sentence that can be pronounced in any Church against any offender to be done by every Christian, either joyntly with the whole congregation, or severally by themselves alone, but not at all in any Judicatory? did ever any *Erastian* in the point of Elders go further? was *Erastus* against the lawfulnesse of some of the peoples sitting with ministers by the Magistrates consent, to cognosce upon some spiritual causes?

Mr. Tombes *is against all excommunication.*

The other point of *Erastianisme*, the censure of excommunition never any *Erastian* I know did deny it further then you. You will have no such censure this day in the world, nor any such ever to have been: The chief grounds of Scripture whereupon it is builded, you pervert them all, (although as I conceive) in a very poor and irrational way, as any who have interest in that question, will easily shew: my interest at this time is only to clear that while I put *Erastianisme* upon you I did you no wrong, and alledged no more then here your self doe avow.

Mr. Tombes *permits the Magistrate to preach and celebrate all Sacraments.*

Beside that which you count the two great branches of *Erastianisme*, Mr. *Gillespy* you say speaks of two others, which I can not shew you to be so. First, That the Magistrate in the New Testament though not in the Old, may exercise the ministerial function, if his leisure from other affaires can permit him. Secondly, That Ecclesiastical government distinct from the civil, is not onely not instituted by Christ, but not lawful nor agreeable to the word of God. This then is the height of *Erastianisme*, which the greatest enemies of the *Erastians* did ever alledge upon them. *If* I make both these good upon you, shall I be still a false Criminator? and both these are very evident in your writings. *Precurs.* pag. 83. You grant the power of preaching in Pulpits to any that are fit, whether Ministers or not Ministers, and so to any Magistrate who will. And page 72. you take away the seat of *Uzziah*'s plague, and give power to others beside Ministers to celebrate both the Sacraments, not only Baptisme, but even the Lords Supper, without so much as the presence of any Ministers. That ever any *Erastian* flew thus high, I do not know.

M. Tombes *puts down all Ecclesiastick Judicatories as unlawfull.*

For the other point, the unlawfulnesse of any Ecclesiastick government, distinct from the Civil; Beside, that no Church-government is lawful, which is not instituted by Christ, you avow that all Church-governments by way of citation and censure is unjust, and more then Scripture allowes; the New Testament permitting no further now adayes then a declaration against heresie and wickednesse, and abstinence from communion with the guilty of such crimes, by the whole congregation, without any censure or sentence from any Court of officers cognoscing of such causes.

The Eighteenth Crimination.

Mr. *Tombes* denies the power of Suſpenſion from the Holy Table.

YOur next four falſe Criminations are but needleſſe, ſpringing out of calumnies; they are nought but the four inſtances *I* brought to prove one and the ſame charge, even the former ſeventeenth Crimination, which now having made good, what needs more of that matter? yet ſince you will have it ſo, *I* ſhall go through what here you bring.

I ſaid you avowed, that no ſcandalous perſon ought to be kept from the Lords Table. I proved this by your denying of all power to ſuſpend from the Lords Table for any emergent ſcandal: you ſay, you ſpoke not of all emergent ſcandals, but of ſome; and you propoſed but your doubt, expreſſely granting me excluſion for ſome ſcandals.

I Anſwer, In the former page you deny that moral uncleanneſſe and ſcandalous manners did keep any from the ſacrifices, and that keeping from the ſacrifices for legal uncleanneſſe was no good ground for keeping ſcandalous perſons from the Table; you reprove *Ameſius* and the Aſſembly for aſſerting a power in the Church to keep from the Table for emergent ſcandals: you deny both to congregations and elderſhips all power to convent any before them for any cauſe. Though to every man by himſelf, and to the whole Church you give liberty to abſtain from familiar company with known inceſtuous people; yet ſince you deny that there is any ſuch cenſure as ſuſpenſion from the communion, or any ſuch thing as any Chriſtian Judicatory which has power to paſſe any ſentence for any cauſe againſt any man; who may not conclude that you will have none ſuſpended from the holy table for any ſcandal whatſoever? For your confeſſion of a new invented abſtinence of all Chriſtians from all openly flagitious creatures, ſince you admit no Eccleſiaſtick Judicatory to convent any offender, to try or pronounce of any perſon, for any cauſe, it is but a meer *Chimera* which never was in the Church, nor ever is likely to be.

Mr. Tombes *new* Chimerick *abſtention from the Lords Table.*

The Nineteenth Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombes* aboliſhes all excommunication.

I Muſt over again to make up my nineteenth crime, be a falſe accuſer of you, for ſaying that you deny all cenſure of excommunication, and yet in this very place you juſtifie all I ſaid. You do not only doubt but are clear and plain, that the thing which all Chriſtians, not only of the reformed Churches, but of the Popiſh, Prelatical, Independent, Anabaptiſtick, or any other known way, call excommunication, has no warrant in the word of God: as for that your *Chimerick* excommunication which your ſelf has invented, and which no other this day on earth I know, does maintain, what have I to do to ſpend time upon its examination?

The

The Twentieth Crimination.

M. *Tombes* denies all Eccleſiaſtick Juriſdiction, and juridical Church-Government.

I Said you hold that Chriſt has not appointed any particular government for his Church on earth: you will have me the twentieth time a calumniator for this, as if you had ſaid no ſuch thing, but the contrary in the places I cite. *Anſw.* I need not go to the places of your Apology, ſince in this very place you ſay clearly all that I alledged. It is not circumſtances about execution of Chriſts orders, which prudence ought indeed to order, that were controverted, but the thing it ſelf of juridical government: you deny here expreſſly that ever Chriſt did appoint any ſuch thing in his Church: you will have no government appointed but only doctrinal by counſel; will any of the Anabaptiſts congregations take this off your hands, and allow you to preach or print againſt all the diſcipline which they exerciſe among themſelves, and which they beleive Chriſt has appointed for all Chriſtian Churches?

Eraſtus *his good parts unhappy to the Church.*

I ſay nothing againſt *Eraſtus* perſon, only all that you can truly ſay for it, comes ſhort, I ſuſpect, of what was true of *Arminius*, *Pelagius*, *Montanus*, and many more, whoſe excellent parts furthered them in propagating their errors. That *Eraſtus* for as much good as can be ſaid of him, was yet an exceeding unhappy inſtrument to marre the ſetling of right diſcipline in many Churches of old and late, to the great hurt of the Goſpel, though you who are his follower ſhould deny it, yet is it ſo evident to the generality of all divines, that I need ſay nothing on that ſubject.

The Twenty one Crimination.

That Mr. *Tombes* puts the government of the Church wholly on the Magiſtrate.

I Am glad that I am come to your laſt calumny, I ſaid you laid the government of the Church on the Magiſtrate only; you deny that you ſpoke a word of that matter: yet in the very place you expreſſe the devolving of juriſdiction from the Magiſtrate upon the Presbytery. Shall the Magiſtrate devolve on others what belongs not to himſelf? do you not in that place of your Apology, deny all divine inſtitution of any Church-government? make you not the Independent and Presbyterian government, both of them to be only matters of prudence? Inveigh you not againſt the Church for executing of cenſures againſt any diſſenters in opinion? declare you not even here for the generality of all Hereticks and Sectaries, whom any Church uſes to excommunicate, as the moſt conſcientious and right-hearted people? ſay you not that the Magiſtrate in juſtice ſhould deprive the Churches of the power of cenſure, which Chriſt has not given them, and they but abuſe to wicked ends? as for the curing of ſcandals, the onely thing you would ſeem to leave to the Churches, ſpoile you not them all even of this alſo, by avowing the places I cite, that when the Churches want even this part of juriſdiction, it is better for them then when they have it? for you ſuppoſe the Chriſtian Magiſtrate executing his judgement, does

provide better against scandals then the Church would do. What jurisdiction then do you leave to the Church, either about doctrine or manners? which you do not either altogether abolish, or put over wholly in the hand of the Magistrate, as going better about it then the Church could? and even when the Magistrate does neglect his duty, you avow that the Church seldom has used any censures with conscience or good effect, and so should not all attempt any such thing. Though you write to this sense clearly, which is the utmost line of *Erastianisme* (as your self grant) yet for telling you of it, I must be stigmatized by you the one and twentieth time a calumniator, that is, in the dialect which now you have made your own, a reporter of nought but plain and simple truth. If it be otherwayes, why without more wrangling will you not speak out your mind in the point? do you indeed believe that the Church without the Magistrate of her own inherent Ecclesiastick power, may execute any spiritual jurisdiction against either adulterers or hereticks? be plain here in contradicting *Erastus* and your own former writings, and *I* shall be very ready to lay down that challenge; otherwayes it will be easie to judge on whose side the calumny does lie.

SECT. XXII.

Concerning Mr. *Tombes* new way and boldnesse.

WAs it not enough that you had made me one and twenty times a false accuser, but yet again you must make me a forger of most reproachful, and scoffical calumnies? Shall there be no end of your good words? for what is this base reproach? I said you had a new way of your own, and when there was so many new ways among us, you thought meet to make a hotch-potch of many of them together: Is there any here but plain truth! have you not indeed taken a way, wherein so farre as I know, you have none, neither antecessor nor follower?

M. Tombes *new way.* You will be first a true-covenanted Presbyter, you will be next a full Antipedobaptist, so far as the confession of the seven Churches does go; you are thirdly a grosse *Erastian*; and fourthly, you are so far a *Socinian* as to give not only the power of preaching, but of celebrating both Sacraments to private persons, yea to persons unbaptized. Is not this a hotch-potch of many ways in one, and that peculiar to your self, wherein as I think you can name none who joynes with you? as for these twenty persons which you have set up in a separate congregation at *Bendley*, I doubt if they will follow you in all these your new singularities.

M. Tombs *boldnesse.* That I did call you a bold man, I need no more proof of it then what here you professe; you say you have tried the strength of all your adversaries, and chose a number of the ablest Divines of the *British* Churches, M *Marshall*, M. *Cotton*, M. *Calamy*, M. *Vines*, M. *Rutherford*, M. *Gillaspie*, M. *Goodwin*, M. *Blake*, M. *Py*, M. *Geree*, and others. The arguments of them all against your errors you pronounce very magisterially to be but meer slights.

SECT.

SECT. XXIII.

Concerning Mr. *Tombes* his dipping.

Mr. Tombes *errors increase.*

VVIll you have this to be my twenty and third calumny, that I said I knew not you were for dipping, though you joyned with Anabaptists in Antipedobaptisme? In your former writings indeed you had not declared your self for dipping, yet in this you think meet to do it to the full; herein you have deceived me, as in many things else. For in your dispute with M. *Baxter*, and in this your answer to me, and in your *Procursor* I find you run out into many extravagancies, of which I did not suspect you before: It is like before all the Treatises you have in hand shall come to the light, that you shall augment the number of your errors above all that is yet known; for in every new writing you vent some new errors, and retract none of the old.

As for your testimonies for dipping, which here you bring in an ostentative multitude, it concerns not me to answer them, albeit at the first blink I see the most of them make evidently against your Anabaptistick way of dipping; alwayes I will not break in on the task of others; learned and acute M. *Baxter* is yoaked with you in that question; before you answer all his arguments against dipping, and have well disingaged your self in all you now are intangled with that Antagonist, it will take you some time: and yet, as if you had not opposites enough to deal with, you will take your self here to the whole Assembly at *Westminster*, resecting both their Directory and Confession in a point wherein they have the full consent of all Christian Churches in the world for many ages, excepting alone the late company of Anabaptists.

SECT. XXIV.

Mr. *Tombes* injurious conclusion.

M. Tombes *needlesse noise.*

IT is well you are at last come to a conclusion, albeit I find it of the same nature with the rest of your writing, bitter and injurious: you say that no Writer, Papist, or Protestant, did ever in so small a compasse as one page in Quarto, wrong so much his adversary, in so many false accusations. *Answ.* How false my accusations have been, I hope I have now cleared. That for a collection so short, that it did go within the compasse well near of one page in Quarto, gathered clearly out of a mans own writings, all which he verifies in his review in a new writing; so loud, boisterous, and large a clamour was ever made by any *Anabaptist*, *Independent*, *Erastian*, or any Sectary of whatsoever name, I do not know.

My calling to meddle with M. Tombes.

What I did in marking yours and other mens errors, was according to my calling from God and men, and my direct errand and imployment in the place then I lived in. If you take it to have flowed from my hatred to your person, you are mistaken in this as in many things else. Oft I have pitied, but I did never hate erroneous persons, whatever was my disaffection to their errors or erroneous writings: albeit they are but few

few to whose Writings I am so angerly affected, as you professe your self to hate mine, even to an abhorrency. *Precurs. p.* 83.

That you with some others did invite me and my colleagues once to dine with you, needed not here to have been objected. The whole City Ministers in several companies most courteously and lovingly did invite my brethren and me, and we oftimes on occasion did invite many of them to our Table; but this was no hinderance for any of us to examine one anothers doctrine. Though once I might have been under a roof and at a table with you, yet truly I remember not that ever I saw you in the face, nor had I ever occasion to know where you dwelt: and though I had been more acquainted with you, yet it could not have hindred me to have collected a page of your printed errors, which before me, your near and school-friends, M. *Geree* and Doctor *Holmes*, and other reverend divines, your good acquaintance had done without any true cause of complaint, though you make hideous clamours against them all.

Mr. Tombes *very evill tongue.*

That yet again you tell me of my false accusing, and doing that for which the devil has his name, as before you remembred me, that I did the devils work, and as elsewhere you will have all who are against your Anabaptisme, to play the part of the devils: I say no more to it, but that you must be constant, and like your self to make your end like your middle and beginning; that all your work may be of one piece, and homogeneous; but of what kind, you deserve better to hear, then it becomes me to speak it.

M. Tombes *by clearing, defiles him more.*

What you threaten in you last words, that if I right you not fully, you will indeavour some other way to wash off the dirt cast in your face by me: you may take whatever way you think expedient. I have given you here such satisfaction as I could, and shewn that you had no reason at all to pronounce any one of my challenges false accusations. I do in all humility submit my part to these my superiours to whom you complain, or to any other equitable Judges you will chuse within the Isle, or in any of the Protestant Churches abroad. My judgement is but weak, yet such as it is I am assured from it, that if your posteriour Apologies be not of another kind, then any yet you have made, you may well with your own hand cast more and more vile dirt upon your own face, but you shall wash off none of that wherewith any man has yet aspersed you.

Beseeching God to give you a righter and more sober mind, I rest,

Glasgow, September 19. 1653.

Yours in all Christian duty,

R. BAILIE.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

THE END.